

40c

MARCH, 1952

34 A YEAR

SOCIAL ORDER

The Totalitarian 'Liberal'

William A. Nolan

Roots of Sociability

William F. Drummond

The Long Loneliness

Raymond Bernard

Book Reviews by Ed Marciniak, Bakewell Morrison, John L. Thomas, Kurt v. Schuschnigg, Maurice Meyers, Thomas McTighe, M. H. Gavin, R. C. Jancauskas, Philip S. Land

. . . just a few things:

THE SPY-TRIALS and so-called witch-hunts whose revelations of disloyalty have shocked us recurrently during the past three years point to a tragic anomaly of America. Most of those found traitors were bright young people, richly endowed by God with native talents and skillfully educated by the state upon which they turned.

The point I would like to make is not precisely the fact that their education (at higher levels, at least) was state education. It is rather the fact that it was *unprincipled* education. Now "unprincipled" is an ugly word; the synonyms commonly given for it are "unscrupulous" and "perfidious." Its literal meaning, however, is not quite so ominous; it simply means, "without principles." But man being what he is, an "unprincipled" man can most easily become an "unscrupulous" and even, as we have seen repeatedly in recent years, a "perfidious" man, that is, one "basely false to trust."

Father Nolan, who perforce spent several years in the atmosphere of decaying liberalism while investigating the Communist campaign to win Negro allegiance, examines our present-day fuzzy liberals briefly and indicates the principle-less dogmas with which they were beguiled to totalitarian ideals.

FATHER DRUMMOND'S ARTICLE, "The Roots of Sociability," springs from a realization that far too many citizens entertain, consciously or unconsciously, the conviction that society and the state are necessary evils. This conviction arises from many sources, among which the ideas of Hobbes and Rousseau can be mentioned as the principal philosophical fonts and the present-day trend

to statism as the principal current stimulus.

Hobbes asserted that some such authority as the state became necessary because men could not be trusted; left to their own devices and desires, they would soon—and constantly—be at each other's throats. Not so, says Father Drummond and, not so, says a rational analysis of man. Man needs society and the state not because of any defect of his natural constitution, but because he was made to live and grow and perfect himself in and through his social life.

From this basic principle of the function of society and the state Father Drummond derives further principles which concern their areas of activity and limitations upon their activity (the principle of subsidiarity).

THE BEST WAY to keep knowledge, they tell us, is to give it away. That's what students at St. George's College, Kingston, Jamaica, do about the knowledge of Catholic social thought which they acquire in their classes with Rev. William H. Feeney, S.J. Under his direction they organize panels to lecture throughout Jamaica on subjects drawn from the papal social encyclicals.

What Jamaican students are doing, any group of energetic American students can emulate. And any informed reader of SOCIAL ORDER, imitating them through less formal exposition of social thought in conversations and discussions can discover, as they did, that "the best way to keep knowledge is to give it away."

IF THE SERIOUS INJUSTICES under which racial, cultural and religious minorities suffer in the United States

were merely a matter of public law, it would be a relatively simple matter to expunge the laws from our books. Unfortunately, however, injustice is much more the bitter fruit of fear and pride, which will be more slowly eradicated from our souls.

For that reason the painfully slow record of advances toward interracial justice has an infinitely more important significance than mere chronicle. Each little gain—even though it entails some local and temporary bitterness—is more than a step forward. It also prepares the way for further gains by making them appear more reasonable.

In this issue we chronicle the advances that have been made in race relations during 1951.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER movement has been a fascinating and provocative reality of American life during the twenty years of its rise, wane and taking roots. It has roused more interest and inspired more following, probably, than any similar movement of our day, here or abroad.

It may be that, in some way, the movement was peculiarly the response of Christianity to the needs of our age; that it is, for instance, a concrete enunciation of *Quadragesimo Anno*. For its paradoxical blending of a conscious and wholehearted adoption of the proletarian condition with a firm conviction of the humane role of property is strikingly akin to Pius XI's central message. It may be that its profound sense of community answers a strong need of our age's atomized lives. Perhaps it is merely that Peter Maurin has distilled from Proudhon, Kropotkin, Bloy, Fr. McNabb, Eric Gill, suffering men, prayer and the gospels a mélange which is an idea: the voice of Christ ("who will be in agony to the end of the world") in our day.

But it is not quite that simple nor that sure.

There are some aspects of the movement that I find disquieting: the tendency to look upon less self-sacrificing Christians as irredeemably bourgeois (even in the awful sense in which Berdiaev and Bloy use that term). Catholic Workers share with others the conviction that industrialism and capitalism—technics, in a word, cannot be christened. Some of them espouse utopian anarchy, which would ask universal self-government of fallen men. Their just demand for charity from all toward all seems to grow imperceptibly into a demand that all embrace the counsel of poverty. Sometimes they seem not merely "to arouse the conscience," in Peter Maurin's words, but to usurp its voice.

No one can question the virtue or the subjective rightness of Catholic Workers. But their ideas must be objectively evaluated, and that is difficult. We are part of our age, sharing its peculiar vices and its nascent virtues. Who, in the circumstances, can be sure what is good for today and tomorrow? How can one avoid the dreadful blunder of Louis Veuillot (who, just a century ago, stamped out the first sparks of the French Catholic social movement)? It is possible that the avowed revolutionary of today is the reactionary, and the apparent reactionary is the revolutionary; but the roles may also be reversed.

At any rate, Father Bernard has not undertaken to determine in his review of Dorothy Day's autobiography, *The Long Loneliness*, precisely what the movement is or what gives it its unique impetus. He has indicated areas of investigation and has asked some pertinent questions. But more remains to be done—and it is well worth doing, partly to help us understand the application of Christianity to the needs of our times, partly to help us understand the times themselves.

F.J.C., S.J.

SOCIAL ORDER

Some American "liberals," duped by the grandiose promises of Marxist propaganda, constitute the gravest source of Communist threat to the safety of American democracy.

THE TOTALITARIAN "LIBERAL"

Tragedy of a Communist Propaganda Victory

WILLIAM A. NOLAN

Institute of Social Order

THE most important area of Communist activity in the United States today is probably the work among certain types of liberals. And, by the same token, it is more necessary for us to understand the impact of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideology upon these people than it is to know anything else about the Communist movement in the United States.

Enforcement of the Smith Act and, perhaps, of other relevant legislation may confine the purely conspiratorial activities of the comrades to preparation for sabotage in the none-too-unlikely event of total war between the United States and the Soviet Union. But the subtly corrosive influence of Communist indoctrination upon the minds of people who live with no certainties and who have no settled, well-founded views of life and democracy may, in the end, do more damage to our cherished institutions than any amount of sabotage by professional revolutionaries.

Since these willing, but unfortunate, victims of Soviet exploitation value most the title of "liberal," we must understand precisely what this highly-esteemed—though much abused—word means.

Old Meaning of Liberal

In the days of ancient Greece, distinction was made between the liberal and the servile arts. Liberal arts were those which free men pursued. The less honorable servile arts, on the other hand, were assigned to the care of slaves. Later,

in the days of Roman greatness, many well-educated slaves engaged in the cultivation of the liberal arts. Nevertheless the basic element in the idea of "liberal" survived, since whoever engaged in the liberal arts had to be *free from something*—in this case, from the necessity of earning a livelihood by means of menial toil.

Coming down to more recent centuries, we find that the word "liberal" has acquired a variety of meanings. One writer facetiously summed up this peculiar situation by declaring that the term "liberalism" has taken on a vaguely sentimental connotation and is, in fact, a sort of rough synonym for anything virtuous, decent, humane and even kind to animals.¹ Not all significations of the word "liberal," however, are so inoffensive even when they are vacuous and futile. Some of them are on the contrary, very sinister and bode ill for the future of western civilization. One in particular will give us much to think about later on in this article.

Religious, Moral Liberals

We might take as our first main division of modern liberals that of "religious and moral liberals." While there are many degrees and varieties of this type of modern liberal, all of them share this characteristic in common: they all want to be free from some or all religious and

¹ Robert Bendiner, "What Kind of Liberal Are You?" *Commentary*, September, 1949, pp. 238-42.

moral restraints.² Some religious liberals are content with being free from the restraint of any organized church. Others go further in their demands for liberty of conscience. They will tolerate no impositions of an objective moral order, preferring to work out their spiritual destinies in the unlimited secrecy of their own minds. This second group constitutes the class of moral relativists, for whom no absolute objective values exist. There is yet a more extreme group of moral liberals, who loudly proclaim man's "right" to freedom from moral restraints of any kind whatsoever. For these libertines of modern society, even the tenuous restrictions of contemporary pagan custom prove unbearably heavy.

Intellectual Liberals

A second main division of modern liberals is that known as "intellectual liberals." This latter group regards the recognition of a supra-human power as a violation of the "integrity" of the individual. What it desires above all is freedom from any force outside itself or, at least, outside that vaguely sentimental ideal known as "humanity." The modern intellectual liberal demands the right to be the sole master of his fate and to have no captain of his soul other than his own unfettered will. Rosalind Murray has brilliantly described this type in one of the most penetrating analyses of our times. In *The Good Pagan's Failure*, she finds its perfect embodiment in the persons of many modern university professors who strive to excel in urbanity, scholarship—and complete reliance upon their own limited powers of intellect.³

² John H. Hallowell, *Main Currents in Modern Political Thought*, New York, Henry Holt, 1950, Sect. IV, "The Crisis of Our Times," evaluates many characteristics of contemporary religious and moral liberalism.

³ Rosalind Murray, *The Good Pagan's Failure*, New York, Longmans, 1948. The thesis of this extraordinarily enlightening

It might be argued that there is no great distinction between the type known as intellectual liberals and the preceding one. This objection is, in large measure, true. On the other hand, not all religious and moral liberals are intellectuals. To attempt a revolt against God does not require a Ph.D. degree or the ability to compose scholarly essays. For purposes of clarity and emphasis, therefore, a second main division has been included in this article.

Economic Liberals

Out-of-date economic liberals constitute the third main division. What this group seeks after most is freedom from restraint of private enterprise by acts of government. Another name for this class is *laissez-faire* liberals, which simply means: "Government, please leave us alone." Economic liberalism achieved its greatest prominence during the formative years of modern capitalist society. Even today, however, some ruggedly individualistic business men still believe that this extreme "philosophy" of industry and commerce is the only solution to contemporary world affairs.

Political Liberals

Modern political liberalism came into being as a form of protest against the excesses of economic liberalism. Since political liberals regard their cherished goal of restraint of privilege as virtually unachievable unless government is granted very extensive powers of control over the financial giants of modern capitalist society, many political liberals harbor varying degrees of sympathy for some kind of socialism or collectivism.

book is that the total Christian alone can meet the challenge of the total barbarian as exemplified in Hitler and Stalin. The "good pagan" or cultured modern liberal, on the other hand, stands confused and helpless as he sees his cherished earth-bound values swept away in the tumult of twentieth-century revolution. For him, the contemporary world becomes—perforce—a dismal prospect of ever-narrowing horizons.

We must never forget, however, that there is no intrinsic necessity for a political liberal becoming a collectivist. So long as he bases his program of social reform upon a sound philosophy of man and seeks legitimate change within the framework of the democratic process, he can successfully avoid the excesses of a socialist state. Such well-balanced political liberals are, indeed, the chief hope of the modern world. They alone can keep it from slipping backwards into stagnant reaction which, sooner or later, must end in socialism. They alone can prevent it from rushing heedlessly along that path of easy reform which also terminates in complete collectivization. If western culture should survive its numerous contemporary ills, it will owe its greatest debt to those political liberals who placed their reliance upon the democratic process and the objective moral law.⁴

Totalitarian "Liberals"

The fifth main division of modern liberals is the one which must give us most concern. In the end, this class of liberals may undermine our democratic institutions more effectively than any amount of sabotage or other subversive action by professional revolutionaries. This class has come to be known by various names, the most accurate of which appears to be "totalitarian liberals." Should this title seem to contain a contradiction, the fault lies not in the words themselves, but in the people to whom they must be applied.

While a liberal may become a devotee of totalitarianism in different ways, most of them take first to the paths of religious, moral or intellectual liberalism. That is, they begin by rejecting the objective moral order or, at least,

by reducing it to an empty formula of vacuous, though perhaps nominally inoffensive, clichés. Next, they continue on their confused journey by placing unbounded reliance in the irrepressible goodness of "humanity" (not, of course, in the intrinsic goodness of human nature, since any reference to "nature" smacks of scholastic obscurantism) and in "humanity's" indestructible capacity for "progress."

Even for a few years after the catastrophe of World War I, it looked as if this "humanitarian" philosophy of life might prove adequate to the needs of contemporary pagan society. What revealed its fundamental emptiness and shattered its most cherished illusions was the rise of Hitler's racial barbarism. Well-bred, but thoroughly unfounded, sentimentalism stood no chance against the storm trooper's nailed boot. If the confused liberal was to survive, he had to embrace a stiffer rule of life. While a few members of this class returned to older, well-tested forms of belief, a much larger number preferred to make their act of faith in the Marxist substitute for religion and objective morality.

Atheist Humanism

There are several reasons why many befuddled liberals chose the totalitarian way of Marx, Lenin and Stalin rather than the Christian or the natural law way.⁵ In the first place, Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism is a *man-made* substitute for religion. As such, it does not violate the "integrity of humanity" by requiring submission to the commandments of a supra-human Being. It is, moreover, completely earthbound in its materialism and in its exclusive interest in the things of sense. These latter characteristics make it congenial to the liberal who has come to identify every-

⁴ Nicholas S. Timasheff, *Three Worlds*, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1946, provides a readable analysis not only of true liberalism, but also of communist and fascist totalitarianism. See also Emmet John Hughes, *The Church and the Liberal Society*, Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1944, Ch. XV: "The Faith of Democracy."

⁵ Wilhelm Röpke, "The Malady of Progressivism," *The Freeman*, July 30, 1951, pp. 687-91, competently outlines certain steps by which many moral liberals move towards totalitarianism.

thing spiritual with the ghostly, ethereal or similar fantasies which "Science" can not measure.

True, some disconcerting rumors are afloat—to the effect that this man-made religion of Marx, Lenin and Stalin may lead to a hell rather than a heaven upon earth. But, when one talks it over with "progressives," one discovers that the bogey of concentration camps, slave labor and MVD liquidations is only the malicious gossip of fascist reactionaries who lack the foresight to believe in the ultimate goodness of the Socialist Fatherland.

Exploitation of "Innocents"

In securer times, such pathetic self-deception on the part of confused liberals might awaken only pity in the hearts of sound-minded citizens. For some years past, however, it has provided a happy hunting ground for cynical Communist agitators, who look down with contempt upon the "innocents" whom they deceive.⁹ Unfortunately, this ruthless exploitation of self-induced ignorance affects not only the totalitarian liberals, but also the saner members of the communities among whom they circulate. Let us, therefore, consider a few of the deceptions which the hard-hearted comrades foist upon the soft-hearted "innocents."

1) *The CPUSA is only a political party.* Communist agitators have beguiled totalitarian liberals with the assurance that the Communist party is nothing more than a political organization interested in the promotion of "unpopular ideas."⁷ What may look like conspiratorial actions to the FBI and the

U. S. Supreme Court are, in reality, mere debates over minority views. Restraint of these well-organized "discussions" would amount to "thought control," which is—for the totalitarian liberal—a fate worse than death.⁸

One-Sided Polemic

2) *It is perfectly good form for anybody to use the most irresponsible and fallacious language in attacking conservatives and "fascists."* It is entirely impermissible for anybody to misplace a period or even a comma in referring to Communists and their sympathizers.

The mere mention of the name of Senator McCarthy causes the totalitarian liberal to seethe with total rage.⁹ On the other hand, he will lightly shrug off the wildest accusations against conservatives and "fascists."¹⁰ "Human sympathy" and a "sense of fair play" compel him to give Party propagandists the benefit of every doubt, no matter

⁹ We must pass over the very interesting question of the relationship of Communists and their sympathizers to the problem of academic freedom in our universities. See, however, Sidney Hook's excellent articles in *The New York Times*, Magazine Section, February 27, 1949, and in *Commentary* for October, 1949. Eight pages of letters attacking and defending Hook's contention that Communist instructors cannot sincerely advocate academic freedom, whereas Catholics can (so far as non-religious matters are concerned), appear in *Commentary* for December, 1949.

¹⁰ Norbert Muhlen, "The Phantom of McCarthyism," *The New Leader*, May 21, 1951, pp. 16-18; William F. Buckley, Jr., "Senator McCarthy's Model," *The Freeman*, "McCarthyism v. Trumanism," *Time*, August 27, 1951, p. 18; Towner Phelan, "Modern School for Scandal," *The Freeman*, September 24, 1951, pp. 813-17. This article is especially valuable because of its direct quotations from a wide variety of sources.

¹¹ "Fascist" is the by-word in pro-Communist circles for anybody whom the Party does not like. For a penetrating exposé of the dishonest mentality of the "anti-Communist," see Daniel James, "The Liberalism of Suicide," *The New Leader*, August 27, 1951, pp. 14-17.

⁹ Eugene Lyons, *The Red Decade*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1941, has colorfully delineated the case histories of some of these "innocents" during their formative years.

⁷ Robert Bendiner, "Civil Liberties and the Communists," *Commentary*, May, 1948, pp. 423-31, describes several aspects of Communist deceit which cannot be considered in this article.

how slanderous or how subversive their declamations may sound to ordinary Americans. Those who criticize the Moscow line, however, must be subjected to the sharpest scrutiny. Totalitarian liberals "know" that all government investigators are, at heart, bedevilled witchhunters.

Guilt by Association

3. *Nobody can incur guilt by association with Communists.* In order to put across this amazing deception, Communist agitators begin by appealing to the well-established rule of American law that guilt is personal, not hereditary or by accidental association (as it was in Nazi Germany and is today in the Soviet Union). Next, they mesmerize the "innocents" with conundrums, such as: deliberate association with fascists makes one guilty, but deliberate association with Stalinists makes one as pure as the driven snow.

In the affairs of their private (as opposed to their totalitarian) lives, the innocents almost invariably apply the test of guilt by association. For example, they are not put at ease to learn that the cashier of their bank consorts with gamblers or that their daughters are out frolicking with the town scoundrels. On the other hand, these same liberals feel that nothing but honor can accrue from defending "the rights" of Communists and from membership in front organizations.

The irony of this situation is that the hard-hearted comrades do not themselves practice this naïve faith of the totalitarian liberal. To cite one example: recently, a Negro unacceptable to the Party was appointed to fill out the unexpired term of a municipal judgeship in a Northern city. When the time came around for him to stand for election, the Party leaders decided to end his term on the bench by associating his name with theirs. They began by endorsing him in their weekly paper. Since that unpopular sheet did not enjoy a wide circulation, they had handbills printed for distribution along the route of a non-Com-

munist Labor Day parade. On one side, these throwaways recommended the election of the Negro judge. On the other, they propagandized the Party line. No stone was left unturned to try to ruin him by associating his name with that of the Communist party.

What the totalitarian liberal never seems to understand is that people who defend Communists and their conspiratorial actions and deceptions are not merely guilty by association, but are also *personally* guilty.¹¹ However, since the totalitarian liberal has only the vaguest notions about the moral responsibilities of the individual person, we can hardly expect him to admit the existence of personal guilt, unless he happens to suffer material damage because of it. Where Communists are concerned, this latter accident is—of course—impossible, since their only "crime" is the entertainment of "unpleasant thoughts." You feel that the totalitarian liberal will be chattering in this foolish fashion up to the very moment that the MVD agent's gun crashes at the back of his neck.¹²

Totalitarian Liberal Degraded

In addition to these three examples, there are many other superstitions which

¹¹A situation might arise where militant anti-Communists must remain in a Party-line organization (e.g., a labor union) in order to rescue it from the clutches of the comrades. Such militant anti-Communists, however, will make the purpose of their association clear and will not permit their names to be used as bait for exploiting "innocents."

¹²According to the renowned authority, Karl von Clausewitz, "the objective of war is to destroy the enemy's will to resist." Those who succumb to totalitarian Communist propaganda have destroyed their own will to resist even before hostilities begin. See, for example, the intellectual surrender of a former U. S. Attorney General in Francis Biddle's *The Fear of Freedom*, New York, Doubleday, 1951. This pathetic work is typical of the confused liberal's flight from reality and of his helplessness in the face of determined barbarians. The Communist *Daily Worker* (Dec. 30, 1951, p. 7) recommends it as a "must" in the fight for freedom.

the totalitarian liberal cherishes with a tenacity that defies rational analysis. Lack of space will not permit us to consider more of them here.¹³ On the other hand, this article would be incomplete without some consideration of the reaction of the totalitarian liberal to the repentant Communist. Here is where we see him at his worst. While Budenz, Bentley, Chambers are condemned, Hiss is not only defended, but even cheered—as if his persistence in treason were an act of virtue.¹⁴

To ordinary Americans, this lack of a sense of elementary justice is simply unintelligible. But, in reality, there is no cause for such bewilderment. What normal Americans are witnessing in the totalitarian liberal's defense of Alger Hiss is nothing more than the panic of a guilty conscience trying to rationalize its own betrayal of our country. As in the case of Socrates and other honorable men of history, conscience-stricken sinners are hoping to regain their lost peace of soul by destroying virtue. In some respects, the condemnation of Whittaker Chambers and the defense of Alger Hiss marked the totalitarian liberal's lowest degradation.¹⁵

Ethical Liberals

There is yet another main division of liberals, who can be grouped together under the designation of "ethical liberals." This group alone truly deserves the title of liberal, since it alone can free mankind from the tyranny of man. As Cochrane has so well pointed out in his penetrating study, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, the ancient pagan

world never arrived at a concept of true liberalism, because it never understood how all men are fundamentally children of God.¹⁶ Unless the modern liberal is prepared to admit this primary fact of human existence, he cannot successfully argue against the ruthless challenge of Stalinist barbarism. It is man's dependence upon God as Creator which endows him with certain rights inviolable by any other creature. As a creature of God, man has fundamental obligations which he must fulfill before he ventures forth to conquer the natural resources of the earth or to develop the refinements of civilization. These prior obligations to his Creator bestow upon him rights with which no other being may interfere.

Nowadays, many liberals think themselves smart and sophisticated as they snicker at the famous preamble to our country's Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created. . . ." But, unless this eloquent introduction to our own political tradition is true, there is no such thing as a valid human right. Might alone prevails in a jungle of endless strife. And the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist philosophy that the individual counts for nothing becomes only the logical conclusion of the modern rejection of the objective moral order.

The contemporary pagan liberal may lament the destruction of all his genteel values. However, unless he possesses greater physical might than that of the Soviet Union his only prospect is undignified liquidation. The appropriate epitaph for his tragic—and futile—existence has already been written:

Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

¹³William Henry Chamberlin, "Fallacies About Communism," *The Freeman*, July 2, 1951, pp. 628-30, summarizes some favorite superstitions of "lost liberals."

¹⁴Victor Lasky and Ralph de Toledano, *Seeds of Treason*, New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1951.

¹⁵Ralph de Toledano, "The Liberal Disintegration," *The Freeman*, November 13, 1950, pp. 109-11.

¹⁶Charles Norris Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1944.

The existence of human society does not spring from a defect of man's nature, but from its wonderful possibility of development realized through mutual interaction.

ROOTS OF SOCIABILITY

Society An Asset, Not a Device of Despair

WILLIAM F. DRUMMOND, S.J.

Weston College

A SHORT article in *Fortune* for November, 1951, "Expansion and Gloom," p. 73, summarizes the forebodings of American businessmen about the future of free enterprise and America's drift toward Socialism. It is a foreboding which is not limited to that group. For the fact is that we are living in an age that is characterized by an ever-growing socialization of life.

Internal and external factors have contributed to this socializing trend. Big business itself has had no small share in it. Men have become necessarily more inter-dependent with the mass movement and activity which has accompanied the modern urbanization and mechanization of life. At the same time, fundamental human needs for fellowship and love have often been thwarted by our growing industrial system and denied by the selfish individualism of many of the system's leaders. Externally, the movements (not the philosophy) of Communism and Socialism, with their promise of peace, plenty and security, have been a strong influence which has forced the western world to reconsider its social structure and to listen to the legitimate claims of those to whom that promise appeals.

Not Unmixed Evil

It is true that this trend to socialization contains the danger of submergence of the individual; it is true that there are those who promote this

trend with this purpose in view, who use it as an occasion to promote totalitarianism.

But before we disassociate ourselves from it completely it would be well to ponder some pertinent remarks of Maritain (*Scholasticism and Politics*, p. 207).

Christians face today, in the social temporal order, problems very much like those which their fathers encountered in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in the order of the philosophy of nature. In those days physics and modern astronomy, which were being born, were closely bound to erroneous philosophies, and turned against tradition. The defenders of tradition were unable to make the necessary discriminations; they chose to be at one and the same time against that which was to become modern science and against the philosophic errors which grew like a parasite upon their science in its origin. Three centuries were required to get over this misunderstanding, if one can say that the world has really gotten over it. We are not required today to repeat all over again the same sort of mistakes in the realm of practical and social philosophy.

The danger to be feared is not so much an increase in the socialization of life. Man is meant to live in community. Nor is the danger in frontal attack from Communism or an open surrender to totalitarianism. Despite differences of opinion as to how we should combat these, the laws of the land, the actions of our courts, the efforts of educational bodies and of labor and business groups all testify that America wants no part in them.

Thrust of Individualism

The danger is rather in an attempt to fit this socialization into an individualistic scheme of society with its false antithesis and dichotomy of "individual" and "state." The paradox of a trend toward "statism" in a people which abhors it can well be explained by the fact that, due to the influence of individualism, men have lost the true meaning of "community" and "society."

The "society" of individualism is nothing distinct from the mere sum of the men who form it. "Individual" and "society" are concepts which differ quantitatively, "society" being a name to denote a number of self-sufficient individuals who have freely contracted to submit themselves to a common power, authority, for the purpose of assuring equality of individual opportunity. Insofar as the formation of society results in any new being, it is the being of political institutions, of legislative bodies, courts and police forces, which concretize the political authority and constitute the "state."

Hence individualism tends to identify the social order with the political order, society with the state. And since government is the agency through which the state acts, socialization necessarily implies government activity and control. That way lies totalitarianism.

State Dominates

This absorption of society in the state is one of the principal complaints of Pope Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Speaking of the reformations of social institutions he says that he has primarily the state in mind. This does not mean that all hope of salvation is to be placed in state intervention. We refer rather to the situation of fact resulting from the evil which we have called "individualism." We once had a prosperous social system which owed its development to the wide variety of associations organically linked together. That structure has been overturned and all but demolished. Individuals are left practically alone with the state . . . (n. 78).

In the beginning the philosophy of individualism restricted state power to the role of an umpire securing equal freedom to competing individuals. Today, however, the old principle of "no intervention" has broken down. The state does regulate business activities; it has assumed a welfare function. But—and here is the difficulty—a philosophy which held such a principle evidently can supply no measure to intervention once it is admitted. Hence that continuous shifting of the conflict between liberties and authorities (cf. SOCIAL ORDER, June, 1951, p. 249), the losing rearguard action in the retreat of individualistic liberalism.

Man Not Individualistic

The problem of the limitation of state intervention is reduced to the fundamental question of the nature and purpose of society of which the state is but a particular form.¹

On this point it is not sufficient to refute the theories of contractualist individualism by the assertion that man is by nature social. Often, in fact, the arguments for the natural sociability of man are so presented as to support the individualist thesis. By this I mean that man is presented as a being who finds

¹ The term "state," therefore, is here used in the sense of a society—civil society. Recent publications:—J. C. Murray, S.J., "The Problem of the Religion of the State," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, May, 1951; J. Maritain: *Man and the State*, University of Chicago Press, 1951—seeking to avoid the errors consequent upon the identification of society and state, have proposed a set of concepts distinguishing "civil society," "state," "people," "government," according to which the term "state" does not denote a society at all. It is not the intention of the present article to dispute the validity of these distinctions. However, while awaiting their further clarification, it seems legitimate to use the term "state" in the same sense in which it is used by the Encyclicals and by acknowledged authoritative works on Catholic Political Philosophy, e.g., Guenechea, *Principia Juris Politici*; Rossmen, *The State in Catholic Thought*; Messner, *Social Ethics*.

in society a remedy for the defects of his nature. Society appears as a necessary evil—a sort of after-thought in the constitution of man—in which he accepts a limitation of his freedom in exchange for the supplementation of his natural deficiency.

There is no doubt that the deficiencies of solitary existence are a sign of the need of social life. Pope Leo XIII's expression of this fact is familiar: "Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life nor procure the means of developing his mental and moral faculties. Hence it is divinely ordained that he should lead his life—be it family, social or civil—with his fellow men, amongst whom alone his several wants can be adequately supplied . . ." (*Immortale Dei*, n. 4).

Not Basic Reason

But social life is not founded solely or even primarily on individual "wants"—"wants" in a strictly utilitarian sense. Any material creature has like needs. A plant needs soil, moisture and sun. An irrational animal "depends" on other animals for birth, for food. But none of these "needs" make such beings social. Irrationals use other creatures according to necessary instincts, but they cannot cooperate for a common end, they cannot knowingly and freely cooperate for a common purpose, because they cannot reason.

True Root

Here is indicated the true root of sociability: rationality. Because man is rational he can love and communicate goodness to others. In this ability there is reflected in the human person the image of God who is Love and Who creates only to communicate His goodness. This potentiality of human nature is brought to realization in society. "It is society which affords the opportunities for the development of all the individual and social gifts bestowed on

human nature. These natural gifts have a value surpassing the immediate interests of the moment, for in society, they reflect the divine perfection which would not be true were man to live alone" (*Divini Redemptoris*, n. 29).

Cumulative Development

Again, it is through reason that mankind adapts all creation to its service, thus bringing creation to its teleological perfection. Such complete adaptation, however, is the work not of one man or of one human intellect but of all, each contributing his part, the findings and accomplishments of one generation being passed on to the next, conserved and improved through social institutions.

Society, therefore, exists for the more perfect realization of the perfection of man as a person. Therein his rational life comes to fulfillment in mutual communication of goods. It is not, therefore, a remedy for the defects of nature which is sought in society but rather the more perfect expression and fulfillment of personality. Man is not social because he needs the aid of others, but conversely, as St. Thomas expresses it (*Contra Gentiles*, III, c. 117), because he is naturally social, he needs the help of others to come to his perfection.

Men achieve their personal perfection according to the plan of God, not as isolated individuals but as mutually complementing and aiding each other, which is, therefore, itself a part of that perfection. Life in society is not merely a utilitarian expedient; it is itself a moral good.

Correlative Obligations

From this conception of society as necessary for the fulfillment of personal life it follows that society can never absorb or destroy the individual person. But from the same considerations it is clear that not every sacrifice of an individual good is an invasion of per-

sonal liberty, which has as its purpose the self-realization of man within the order of his divinely given nature. Man, an intelligent, responsible agent, must realize his personal perfection by his own initiative. But the same obligation which rests on him to seek that perfection also places on him the obligation of seeking those social ends which are the condition of his personal perfection.

Spheres of Cooperation

It is, furthermore, natural that many relatively autonomous spheres of cooperation should grow from the social nature of man. For the ends which man seeks through society are themselves many and diverse. Some of these ends are directly ordained by nature, as for instance the propagation of the race; others are freely chosen, as cultural associations. And about each of these various ends different social groups arise, all springing from the rational nature of man seeking self-realization through cooperation, each with a responsibility for the attainment of its specific end and consequently, too, with the power of self-determination in pursuing that end.

Relative Autonomy

The autonomy of these groups is real, derived as they are from the self-determining rational nature of man; but it is also, as we have mentioned, relative. For there is a further general common good which unites them all in a universal society—the civil society or state. That general common good consists in the opportunity for the full temporal complementation of the human person which results from the cooperation of these many, qualitatively various groups.

The principle of social unity is, thus, not the external force of political government but rather the existence of a common good or of a number of organically related common goals towards which rational men freely move.

For it is natural that just as those who dwell in close proximity constitute townships, so those who practice the same trade or profession in the economic field or any other, form corporate groups. . . . A bond of union is provided both by the production of goods or the rendering of services in which employers and employees of one and the same vocational group collaborate; and by the common good which all such groups should unite to promote, each in its own sphere, with friendly harmony. In these corporations the common interests of the whole vocational group must predominate; and amongst these interests the most important is to promote as much as possible the contribution of each trade or profession to the common good of the state (*Quadragesimo Anno*, nn. 83-85).

Natural Plurality

From this natural plurality of social ends, therefore, there results a natural plurality of communities organically and hierarchically linked in a supreme unity of order, the civil society or state; the functions, authority and autonomy of each group being determined by its proper end.

Consequently, neither is the state synonymous with society, nor are the functions of the state coextensive with those of society. The necessity of attaining the common good of the social whole, being part of the divine plan for man, legitimizes state authority in principle; but it also, in principle, limits that authority. For the common good is also decisive of the rights and responsibilities of individual persons and social forms that grow from the rational nature of man within the state. State authority may only protect, assist and coordinate the inferior social forms. It may not abolish them or substitute itself for them.

Subsidiarity

Hence is derived the principle of subsidiarity which Pope Pius XI calls "a fundamental principle of social philosophy unshaken and unchangeable:"

Just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to a group what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil

SOCIAL ORDER

and a disturbance of right order, for a larger and higher association to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower societies. . . . The state therefore should leave to smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance which otherwise would greatly distract it; it will thus carry out with greater freedom, power and success the tasks belonging to it alone because it alone can efficiently accomplish these: directing, watching, stimulating, restraining, as circumstances suggest and necessity demands. . . . (*Quadragesimo Anno*, nn. 79-80).

Excessive individualism has swept away this organic structure of society and with it has swept away the definite limits of the expansion of state activity and power. It has made the state the sole controlling power of social life. The state will cease to absorb social functions when the members of society accept the responsibility of their freedom to form self-regulating associations which make state centralization unnecessary.



On Three Continents

Social leaders, Bishops, priests, students and observers keep up with news in race relations through

The Interracialist

Founded in 1946

Monthly newsheet edited by the Race Relations Conference

FIFTY CENTS A YEAR

PUBLISHED BY THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL ORDER

3655 West Pine Blvd.

St. Louis 8, Mo.

Students of St. George's College, Kingston, Jamaica, spread knowledge of the papal social program, which they learn in school, throughout the island by their lectures.

SOCIAL TEACHING IN JAMAICA

Students Explain Encyclical Reforms to 43 Audiences

WILLIAM H. FEENEY, S.J.

Kingston

ONE day last June six members of the Phi Gamma Chi Society of St. George's College, Jamaica, B. W. I., assembled at the Railway Sport Club in Kingston to explain the occupation group system of the encyclicals. The Railway Literary and Debating Society, a predominantly non-Catholic group, was the host, and 46 office workers were present when Mr. Keith Campbell, the chairman, called upon the first speaker at 4:50 p. m.

This was the twenty-eighth appearance of Phi Gamma Chi speakers before Jamaican groups. Their favorite discussion topics are family allowances, universal old age pensions and the occupational group system. Usually six speakers appear on the panel, each of whom speaks approximately eight minutes. All are students who learned topics in classes of social science, private study and discussion.

Applies to Jamaica

The first speaker, Mr. Rhoden, listed the chief social problems of the day, then singled out class warfare for special attention, affirming that the occupational group system would abolish it. He explained that the new system would be predominantly a vertical structure, visualizing each branch of the economy of Jamaica as a pillar of the edifice. He then described the composition of one of these groups, using Jamaica's major industry, sugar, as an example.

Mr. Muschette, the second speaker, continued the explanation by comparing the Citrus Growers Association with the ideal Citrus *Occupational* Group. He also compared the inter-group council of the occupational system with Jamaica's Central Committee of Primary Producers. The latter is a federation of associations devoted to agricultural and pastoral pursuits. In stressing the similarities and dissimilarities of the different bodies he made clear the public legal status of the occupational group and its autonomy.

Mr. Maurice Richardson, who had arranged this appearance of the group, spoke on the powers of the managing committee of an occupational group and used as a point of comparison the guild system of the Middle Ages. He also insisted on the absolute need of a renovation of morals.

These three speakers remained on the theoretical level, but Mr. Vincent Isaacs, the fourth speaker, brought the listeners into the practical order by describing the present-day organization of industry in Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. Then Mr. Philip Nash emphasized the advantages of the system, dwelling principally on the abolition of class warfare and the relief of government from countless activities that are not rightfully hers. The last speaker, Mr. Muir, described the way in which the occupational group system would lead to increased economic prosperity. He closed

SOCIAL ORDER

by advocating some practical measures such as the encouragement of trade unions, employer associations, labor-management committees and the development of the Central Committee of Primary Producers and the Jamaica Manufacturers' Association. He likened these to the raw material out of which the new system could be produced.

The Discussion Period

One of the first objections (and it comes up at every appearance) is this: "Your system would do away with trade unions." This is answered by a flat denial and as an argument from authority, paragraph 85 of *Quadragesimo Anno* (*Reorganization of Social Economy*, p. 424) is adduced. But this does not satisfy the questioner, who presses for the precise role of the trade union when the plant council (labor-management committee) handle social and personal problems and have certain other rights.

The excellent article, "Labor-Management Cooperation," by Father Leo C. Brown, S.J. (*SOCIAL ORDER*, May, 1951; and especially note 5 on p. 213) has helped the speakers much, but the lack of uniformity therein described has prevented them from giving to the defender of the trade union a categorical answer.

At a previous appearance, one objector expressed his fears for the continued existence of the trade unions in this form: "Trade unions came into existence because of the injustices committed by capitalists against the workers. But your system is going to do away with all injustices. Therefore, it will do away also with trade unions."

That stopped Mr. Muschette, but Mr. Richardson pointed out that there is in man a natural inclination to search out and associate with men who do the same kind of work or have the same interests, and consequently the trade unions will persist. From this episode it is evident that further expert studies on the jurisdictional field of the plant council and the trade union will be very welcome.

Occupational Groups

Let me here give some background. In the discussions following the first three appearances of this panel, the audiences expressed their doubts about the power of the occupational groups to abolish class warfare. The basis of the skepticism seems to be this: Trade unions have been obtaining for the workers shorter hours, higher pay, better working conditions and other benefits some time now, and there is no apparent disappearance of the classes. *On the contrary, the present system seems to be perpetuating the division of classes.* How then do you claim that such things as plant councils, while doing less than the trade unions, will accomplish more in this matter of abolishing class warfare?

The speakers are accustomed to meet at St. George's College on Wednesday evenings from five to six to find and discuss answers for the objections raised at the public appearances. The pondering of the problem just given led them to conclude that if profit sharing was a part of the occupational group system, the skepticism about its power to abolish class warfare would disappear. But was profit sharing a part?

Profit Sharing

Those who held it was pointed to authors who explained profit sharing when they explained the occupational group system, thereby implicitly saying that one involved the other. Those who said "no" pointed out that in *Quadragesimo Anno*, profit sharing is recommended in the division dealing with the just wage, to be precise, in n. 65 (*Reorganization of Social Economy*, p. 419), while the occupational group system is described later and apparently as something distinct.

The consensus of opinion after those discussions was that profit sharing was a part of the system—so a page and a half was added to Mr. Nash's speech. He described the extraordinary example of profit sharing at the Quality Castings

Company, (*America*, October 22, 1949, p. 70; *SOCIAL ORDER*, February, 1951, p. 65) and also the convention of 276 profit sharing firms held at Cincinnati, Ohio, in December, 1950. The feeling of skepticism just referred to has practically disappeared.

But not entirely. One of the listeners at the railway club appearance pressed Mr. Isaacs for explicit references to profit sharing in the present Western European legislation. None were adduced.

How Share Deficit?

We have not been put at ease by reading, subsequently to the Railway appearance, these lines of E. J. Ross in *Fundamental Sociology* (p. 426): "It [the vocational group system] would have nothing to do with the ownership of property and business enterprise and would *not even require profit sharing*, although the Pope praised the latter system in *Quadragesimo Anno*, too." (Italics mine.)

There was another question on profit sharing which the speakers had foreseen and discussed, but could not answer. It was this: "The Jamaica Government Railway is running at a deficit every year. Therefore we, its employees, will never get any extra income through your system of profit sharing." In the study session that followed this appearance it was felt that family allowances was the answer to that question.

Other Questions and Observations

Here are some other questions and objections often raised by audiences.

"Is this system anything like the Fascism of Mussolini, or the Nazism of Hitler, or the regime of Franco Spain?"

"Your system can never be introduced here, because we are a subjected people and country."

"Will this system come in by law, or how?"

"Can this system be introduced without a revolution?"

"Even if it were introduced, it would very soon be dominated by the capitalists."

"Your system can work only in a socialistic country."

Around the Drinks

At about a quarter to seven, although hands were still being raised for questions, the president of the railway society called for the vote of thanks. After this the speakers were conducted to a long table on which there was a tub of cracked ice and an assortment of bottles, the host's tangible token of appreciation. Here in a less formal and friendlier fashion, there followed more discussion.

Someone asked when the occupational group system was first thought out. Then one mused thus: *If the Rochdale cooperatives took so long to spread through the world, we shouldn't be impatient at the slow progress of this system.* This same man affirmed that the best means for the economic and social betterment of the people he had ever heard of were the Rochdale cooperatives and the system just explained.

Another man stated that of the eleven conferences that the railway society had sponsored, this was the most interesting. Still another person got some badness out of his system in asking: "Is it true that the Catholic Church supports capitalism?"

The secretary of the railway society was all apologies for two reasons, first, because more members hadn't attended, and secondly, for what he thought was excessive opposition on the part of many who did attend. The speakers reassured him and added that opposition always makes the appearances more interesting.

The next day the reason for the absence of some of the workers became known. A non-Catholic on the office force had canvassed some of the workers and urged them not to attend simply because the speakers were from a Catholic college. But the lively discussions on the occupational group system by those who had attended plus a little reflection produced regret in those who had stayed away.

Lecturing on Family Allowances

Another panel of Phi Gamma Chi speakers of St. George's College has already explained and advocated family allowances to fifteen audiences. The audience reactions may prove interesting. But let me first mention the phases explained by the speakers.

Mr. Herbert Binns begins by explaining *the need for family allowances*. Mr. Keith Campbell follows him with a *brief history* of allowances, tracing their growth first from one industry to another, as was the case in France, and then from one country to another. The third speaker, Mr. Ferdinand Figueroa, gives the tentative *plan* for Jamaica—five shillings per week for each child of married parents. Mr. Vincent Campbell then grapples with the hardest problem, *the financing* of the plan. He recommends a six per cent tax on the payroll of commerce and industry (five per cent from company and one per cent from worker) to take care of the children of that class of workers, and an additional ten per cent tax on the land and cattle to take care of the rural children.

The fifth speaker, Mr. Noel Rennie, answers some of the stock objections—"the money will be misused;" "Business will succumb under the burden of the payroll tax;" "a man's pay should depend on the work he does, not on his household bill."

The last speaker, Mr. Michael Falla, enumerates some benefits, as the destroying of desperate domestic worries, better care and training of children, the lessening of the threat from Communism.

Reactions are Various

The general impression produced on the audience was quite varied. You met two extremes. A constable at Spanish Town asked in gratified surprise: "Why aren't those speeches published in pamphlet form and circulated throughout the island?" At the other extreme you had the listener who slurringly characterized the whole plan as a belated at-

tempt to do good by adopting the Communist principle, "to each according to his need."

Many of the questions referred to the practical operation of the system. "Would a man who is earning as much as twenty pounds a week get the allowances?" "Would a poor cultivator, unmarried, running only a small farm, have to contribute to the pool?" "Wouldn't the administrative costs of such a plan make it impractical?" "If both father and mother are working, how much would the allowances be?" "What does the plan do for widows and orphans?"

One listener contended that there was no equality between an additional ten per cent tax on land and cattle paid *once a year* and a six per cent tax on the payroll paid *weekly*. Another suggested that as the cost of living in the rural parts was less than in the city, the allowances should vary; for example, four shillings in the country, six in the city.

More Objections

At a Catholic normal school for girls a student asked the embarrassing question: "How can you put down attendance at school as a condition for receiving the allowances, when Jamaica hasn't got the schools to receive the children?" One of her companions was more interested in knowing how misuse of funds could be prevented. She wanted to know whether the mother or the father would receive them (and strongly favored the mother).

At an appearance in Kingston before the Progressive Club two new objections came up. A man who had studied economics contended that no real good could come to the family man from the allowances. He quoted the principle, "The consumer always pays." This means that any increase in the cost of producing an article is passed on inevitably to the consumer by an increase in price. The paying of this increase, he contended, would cancel any good that the allowances would bring to the fam-

ily man. This same idea was repeated in less learned terms by simple people in the rural areas. It was urged against the plan by some of the clergy also.

Illegitimacy and Concubinage

The second objection was formulated not against the plan as a whole, but against the restriction of the allowances to legitimate children. When one reflects that about 70 per cent of the children are illegitimate one sees that there is a real basis for the objection. One man asked: "Since the child has done no wrong, why should he be penalized?" Another bluntly asked: "So you advocate visiting the sins of the father on the child?" Evidently, any law seemed preposterous that would oblige men to contribute to a family allowance pool for legitimate children when they have illegitimate children of their own poorly provided for.

On the other hand, the speakers felt that restricting the allowances to legitimate children would be a powerful spur to marriage for thousands living in concubinage. This would wipe away a national stain. And both the speakers and objectors agreed that the illegitimacy rate would mount even higher if legitimates and illegitimates were to receive identical treatment. (The views of SOCIAL ORDER readers on this problem would be very welcome.)

Caught Unawares

Most of the audiences to whom family allowances were first explained were Catholic. The remainder were deferential enough not to advocate as an alternative measures condemned by the Church. This was not the case, however, at the University College of the West Indies. As soon as the last speaker sat down, one of the student body present (most were medical students) rose and said with great aplomb: "I don't agree with your plan. The only solution to our problem is birth control." That was the first time that this point had come up and frankly the speakers were unprepared. The majority in the

hall seemed to have the same views as the objector, supporting him by quotations and arguments drawn from recent books on overpopulation and the inability of the earth to produce sufficient food for all.

Books propounding this latter idea were creating quite a furor at the time, since many readers accepted as gospel truth every word in them. Unfortunately, the articles refuting those theories had neither the publicity nor the popularity that the books had. And the statement by one of the panel that it wasn't a matter of overpopulation but underproduction didn't seem to register.

At a subsequent appearance a non-Catholic led the speakers and the audience up to the topic of birth control by this question: "Does the general history of family allowances show that they tend to increase the number of children?" As the answer was affirmative, the questioner at once condemned them, arguing as had the university students.

Opportunities Challenged

On several occasions this idea was expressed, *I understand the plan and it is a good one, but it seems to me that your efforts should be directed towards solving our terrible unemployment problem, which is the cause of much of our misery.* Akin to it was the repeated question: "What does your plan do for the unemployed?" The fact that it did nothing made the speakers painfully aware that there was need of other forms of social security, such as unemployment insurance. At the University one listener asked: "Why is this plan given priority? The need for more education facilities is greater than the need for these allowances." Others, however, impatiently inquired about the measures that were being taken by the panel to have the allowances introduced by law.

Such were most of the objections, observations and suggestions met with while recently stumping for family allowances, profit sharing and occupational groups in Jamaica.

Many significant advances in interracial justice were obtained in the United States during 1951, even though serious and deep-seated inequity continues to be widespread.

YEAR OF SMALL GAINS

Community Race Relations Advance Steadily

A SOCIAL ORDER Report

PROGRESS in race relations is never easy to measure, so many and complex are the factors involved. Limiting the measurable time to roughly one year makes progress still harder to gauge. The balance-sheet for 1951 may scarcely seem to show a notable gain.

Yet the cumulation does contain some significant steps, particularly those initiatives quietly taken in the Southern states by Catholic leaders. The general progress becomes much clearer if the observer tries to visualize the total result of ten similar years—even without an increase of momentum.

This brief record has one great value: it shows a wider, quickened interest, an awareness among many in the South also that race relations are not a static enigma, the growing realization that Christianity cannot accept every *status quo*. It adds up to this: Catholics can do something and are doing something, to solve a soluble "problem."

Sports and entertainment developments are so well-known that they are taken for granted. They are, nevertheless, important.

Population

Census reports for 1940-1950 lately released indicated a strong continuing trend for the Negro population to shift to industrial areas outside the South. The population of seven states, for instance, showed losses for the decade and in six others the increase totaled only 55,637.

Yet the national Negro total was up 15.8 per cent. Industrial California, Il-

linois, Michigan, New Jersey, Missouri, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania had gained 1,555,451 Negroes.

Interracial Effort

The sixteenth Catholic Interracial Council was established at San Antonio, Texas, the seventeenth at Rock Hill, South Carolina, under the patronage of Bishop Russell. Three Negroes were accepted into the Knights of Columbus at San Antonio, and another in Kansas. Segregation has been ousted from the Air Force, is dropping in the Navy and weakening in the Army. Thirty parochial schools in St. Louis have integrated student bodies.

Last Lent the Archbishop of New Orleans, Most Reverend Joseph Francis Rummel, issued a statement abolishing segregation of any sort in the archdiocesan churches and promising further steps in integration. Late in November, the Bishop of Lafayette, La., Most Reverend Jules B. Jeanmard, likewise issued a statement favoring efforts at integration, especially in politics. Private Catholic high schools in New Jersey showed the way to other segregated private schools, to the admiration of the Negro press.

However, Dr. Liston Pope, dean of Yale University Divinity School, pointed out to a conference held by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in December that "the churches have a lot of house cleaning to do before they can call themselves Christian." Politics, sports, education, trade unions and industry, said he, have far outstripped the churches in breaking down racial barriers.

Other Achievements

Interracial organizations and study groups of Catholics grew up in Natchez, Shreveport, Charleston, Greensboro, Jacksonville, elsewhere in the South.

Negro children participated in the "I Speak for Democracy" contest in New Orleans and Atlanta, won the Georgia title. At Des Moines a Negro lawyer was named "Young Man of the Year." Not only was Negro Howard Swanson's *Short Symphony* played by the New York Philharmonic in Carnegie Hall and at the Edinburgh Festival, but it was later voted the best new orchestral work heard in 1951 in New York.

Four Negro seminarians were ordained priests to bring the total to 46. More seminarians than ever are now studying at St. Augustine's (Bay St. Louis, Mississippi): 21 major seminarians, 75 minor.

Politics

Twenty-five Negro legislators in state bodies, chiefly in Missouri, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, Kansas, California, Arizona, New Jersey, bore witness to some voice in law-making. Judges were holding office in urban centers such as New York (Harold A. Stephens, of the board of directors of the Catholic Interracial Council there), St. Louis, Chicago and Miami (here, a reappointment). Candidates ran for school board posts in New Orleans, Memphis and Rome, Georgia.

Several Negro ministers took over school board posts (Hartford, Knoxville) and public offices (Louisville and Charles City, Virginia). Petersburg, Virginia, elected a local Democratic committee with one-third Negro membership. Negroes were holding jobs in New York City's public school administration and city commission.

Negro Candidates in South

The Democratic party in Louisiana opened the state primaries to Negro voters and candidates for the first

time since Reconstruction days. Five Negroes filed for the state legislature race, one for governor. Negro registration jumped 230 per cent to 95,000, yet the Negro candidate for governor won only 6,000 votes.

By the pocket veto of a \$2 million proposal, President Truman halted a move to spread segregated schools in defense areas, saying that progress toward equal treatment and opportunity would not admit any "backward step." Southern congressmen had supported the measure in both houses.

Governor James F. Byrnes fumed about converting South Carolina's public school system into private schools, should court decisions abolish segregation there. Governor-elect Hugh White also announced such an intention for Mississippi. Georgia's legislature actually passed a measure to withdraw public support of institutions mixing races in classrooms.

Civil Rights

Observers estimate that this election year will see some two million Negroes vote in the South, especially since South Carolina and Tennessee abolished the polltax. Alabama enacted a new legal barrier to Negro voting over widespread opposition (including the Bishop of Mobile, Most Reverend T. J. Toolen).

West Memphis, Arkansas, today operates a \$1,200,000 interracial hospital. Augusta, Georgia, and 81 other Southern cities now employ 443 Negro policemen. Little Rock has opened the main branch of its public library to non-whites; Austin, Texas, has done the same for its two city libraries. Georgia legislators surprisingly outlawed the wearing of masks except for traditional holidays, as well as the burning of crosses on private property and public places. Negro lawyers of Galveston were admitted to the county bar association. The medical society of Virginia made efforts to open its ranks to Negroes; a Florida county medical so-

SOCIAL ORDER

city already has accepted two Negro doctors.

Injustice Reversed

Charges placed against the owner and renters of the property at Cicero, Illinois, about which mobs rioted in July were eventually dropped, and the town president, attorney, police chief, fire marshall and several policemen were indicted by the federal grand jury called by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath to investigate the disgrace. Conviction on either of two charges would carry a maximum penalty of \$1,000 fine and a year in jail. Newspaper comment praised this serious attempt at guilt-fixing.

Bishop Frank A. Thill of Salina and Monsignor Eugene F. Valley (then administrator of the Kansas City, Kansas, diocese) supported a proposed F.E.P.C. for Kansas in a public statement. By executive order December 3, President Truman established a "Little F.E.P.C." with the following members: Dwight R. G. Palmer, General Cable Company; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, C.I.O.; Donald H. Davis, Kansas City *Call* general manager; Irving M. Engel of the American Jewish Committee; Oliver W. Hill, Richmond attorney, and George Meany, secretary-treasurer, of A.F. of L.

Interracial Violence

Several glaring instances of violations of civil rights occurred, to the amazement of the rest of the world. There was one lynching classified by Tuskegee Institute (which lists only "fatal" cases)—three attempts were frustrated. The Cicero riots participated in by Catholic students made headlines in India, Africa, Russia.

At Opelousas, Louisiana, a Negro who had attempted to register as a voter was killed by a deputy sheriff. Another later died of a beating inflicted in the same town. These incidents were exploited by the party-line Civil Rights Congress in this country and in Paris

before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In Lake County two surviving defendants in the Groveland rape case were shot by the Florida sheriff, one fatally; the other, pretending death, lived despite wounding by another officer to charge the sheriff with deliberate murder. The sheriff was quickly exonerated. Walter White and the Russian diplomat Vishinsky, among others, protested the brutality. White's N.A.A.C.P. was promptly labeled "communist" by the Florida judge presiding over the trial of the wounded survivor when Thurgood Marshall, N.A.A.C.P. attorney, attempted to participate in the case.

A Florida educator active in the Groveland case and N.A.A.C.P. works, who held that progress in race relations comes only at the price of sacrifice, was bombed to death at Christmas; his wife died shortly after of injuries in the same explosion.

Discrimination

A Connecticut A.F. of L. local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers was told to desist from excluding Negroes because of race. The manager of a Marshall, Texas, movie-house was fined \$200 for showing "Pinky" despite the ban by local censor-board, and a test-case to be supported by the film industry was begun. Finding that two companions would suffer discrimination in Knoxville hotels, 53 foreign exchange students about to tour the T.V.A. passed up the inspection trip in protest—and have doubtless mentioned the incident at home.

A Winnebago Indian army sergeant, about to be lowered into the earth after Catholic burial rites, was barred from interment in a Sioux City, Iowa, cemetery by a restrictive clause; he was later buried in Arlington. A similar case in Phoenix took six weeks before public pressure forced a Mason-owned cemetery to bury a Negro veteran.

In November the annual statement by the American Catholic hierarchy

clearly taught that "one and the same standard prohibits false statements about individuals, and false statements about members of minority groups and races." Firmness in dealing with white nurses who disliked the integration of Negro nurses in St. Francis Hospital, Charleston, West Virginia, called forth wide praise for the Sisters in charge. Relations now among staff members have "never been so friendly and cooperative."

Education

More white Southern universities and colleges admitted Negro students, chiefly at the prod of Supreme Court decisions and fear of embarrassment. Well over a thousand were reported in attendance. Negro universities in the same area took in a record number of white students. Both Xavier and St. Augustine's Seminary today admit white students. One Negro who entered Louisiana State University on Federal court order soon withdrew because of "disqualifications," but during the year six others made their way into the L.S.U. law, graduate and nursing schools. Negro law students entered Chapel Hill, N. C., classes. Medical students are now received at the Universities of Virginia, Arkansas and Texas.

Without recourse to law, medical students now attend Creighton, Marquette, St. Louis, Loyola of Chicago. Two Catholic colleges at San Antonio, Incarnate Word College and Our Lady of the Lake, and two at Louisville, Nazareth and Ursuline, also opened their doors to Negro girls last September. St. Benedict's minor seminary (New Orleans archdiocese) now has Negro students.

The bulletin of the Southern Regional Council (August-September) announced that Loyola University of the South at New Orleans admits Negroes. One of every 85 students under Jesuit educational direction in 1951 was a Negro. A Negro athlete has enrolled at Notre Dame. Five West Point

graduates last June were Negroes.

The Southern Methodist Council of Religious Activities approved a student resolution asking that S.M.U. admit Negroes. Emory University theology students voted 210-13 to admit Negroes. The Board of Regents by a 66-25 vote recommended opening the University of the South at Sewanee and the Episcopal ministerial college at Lexington, Kentucky. All four Southern Baptist ministerial schools are now open to Negroes. Four Presbyterian schools (Austin, Louisville, Richmond, Decatur, Georgia) also are non-segregated.

Integration Urged

The Catholic editor of the University of Mississippi student newspaper, Albin Krebs of Pascagoula, publicly attacked discrimination in Southern education and maintained his position on the publication; later he addressed the annual convention of the N.A.A.C.P. at Atlanta.

A poll of Southern teachers yielded interesting results. Of the 3,422 replies to a Southern Conference Educational Fund questionnaire, 2,412 educators favored opening existing graduate and professional schools to Negroes.

Elementary schools entered the picture too. The Fort Bragg, North Carolina, post school, which includes 36 colored children along with its 1,175 white youngsters without segregation, is believed to be unique in the South. Alton, Illinois, ended its segregation policy in primary schools after fifty years. Public schools in Washington and Baltimore remain segregated, although Catholic schools no longer have the bar. Tucson, Arizona, integrated both teachers and pupils in its system. A proposal to amend the Day Law further and desegregate the non-public schools of Kentucky has been initiated by the Catholic school board of Louisville.

Legal Action

Law suits to drive the wedge further into the elementary systems were begun. In Little Rock, Arkansas, such a suit

was entered against the public school authorities. Delaware too is facing legal action. In New Orleans, a Catholic lawyer acting for parents of students petitioned the school board for integration, as did Negroes in Jonesboro, Louisiana. Negro students of Sumter, South Carolina, charged discrimination against city and county officials. In Clarendon, South Carolina, a three-judge Federal court ordered the local system to show progress within 60 days at equalizing facilities—it decided that such a provision was constitutional. A similar case has been filed in Topeka. The N.A.A.C.P. will appeal the Clarendon case to the Supreme Court. The filing of the Clarendon case was the occasion of the threat by Governor Byrnes (an ex-Catholic, now a Mason) to convert public into "private" schools.

Dr. Ralph Bunche, Nobel Prize-winner and member of the Harvard faculty and Director of Trusteeships of the United Nations, was offered the presidency of City College of New York but declined, feeling that he could do more good in his present position. Shortly after, he was appointed to the Educational Policies Commission of N.E.A. and the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Bunche ranked No. 9 in the Gallup poll for "Man of the Year."

The 1951 Hoey Medals were won by Mrs. Roger L. Putnam, head and originator of the Catholic Scholarships for Negroes, Inc., and by Dr. Francis M. Hammond, head of the philosophy department at Seton Hall University, formerly an instructor at Xavier in New Orleans.



For April

Mixed Marriages—So What?

John L. Thomas

Parish Membership and Above

Joseph H. Fichter

Leisure and Work

Francis J. Corley

The Conduct of Life

Edward Duff

End to Jew-Gentile Indictment

John E. Coogan

REVIEWS * TRENDS * WORTH READING * LETTERS

Four dollars a year—forty cents a copy

SOCIAL ORDER

3655 West Pine Boulevard

St. Louis 8, Missouri

The autobiography of Dorothy Day constitutes practically a history of the Catholic Worker movement, of which she is a founder and an inspiring guide since its beginning.

THE LONG LONELINESS

Ex-Communist Talks of God, Her Work, Her Life

RAYMOND BERNARD, S.J.

SOCIAL ORDER

MANY people may be led by the subtitle of this book¹ to think that it is only a personal history. Dorothy Day herself may confirm such a snap judgment by apologies and humble confessions as well as by the length of her pre-conversion record.

More significance may attach to *The Long Loneliness* than perhaps either publisher or author realizes. It is the autobiography of a movement, an invitation to reflect on the growth of social consciousness among us American Catholics, a book that ignites compassion. After all, Peter Maurin, the little French wanderer who inspired the Catholic Worker movement, considered himself an educator and agitator and dreamed of founding an educational work.

There are many pages in *The Long Loneliness* which could provoke fruitful discussion and perhaps move both friends and foes of the Catholic Workers to better understanding of some special points raised by both groups. One would like here to explore poverty, the community, the philosophy of work, method and technique in social change, the dedication which Father Yves de Montcheuil, S.J., calls "total commitment," the Works of Mercy, discussion groups, the history of Catholic social thought and action in this country, many other subjects touched

in this book—but we have the promise of three contributors to SOCIAL ORDER to tackle some of these points at length.

Movement Well Established

No longer new, no longer looked upon as radical and shocking, the Catholic Worker movement is today a part of the American scene. Earlier, Bishop Hugh Boyle had told Dorothy Day during a unionization drive, "You can go into all the parishes in the diocese with my blessing, but half the pastors will throw you out."

The one permanent figure in the movement, the author of this book, on whom the management of the hospice and its associated branches has fallen, necessarily has been forced to focus her attention on the various magnificent works of mercy undertaken by the transient but few staffmembers for the transient but plentiful poor. Dorothy is the one visible factor of continuity, and it is natural and just that the Catholic Worker be identified with her. Thus her restrained prose here tells a double story.

Next November 8, Dorothy Day will reach her fifty-fifth birthday. Her first six years were spent in Brooklyn, her birthplace, before she began the long journeying that led her to the Catholic Church and her present work.

Childhood in Berkeley and Oakland, where the head of the family went next in his newspaper work, was quiet, joyful, spent in a small frame house on the

¹ THE LONG LONELINESS: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day. Harper, New York, 1952, 288 pp. \$3.50.

fringe of town, near the open fields and wooded hills. Only eight at the time of the great earthquake, the youngster was vividly impressed by the open charity and sincere cooperation she saw among the California people.

Meets First Catholic

In Chicago, where she encountered her first Catholic, the Day home was over a store in a block of crowded tenements. The only sense of freedom young Dorothy felt was in a park or in the patch of blue sky visible from a back porch. After moving four times in Chicago and attending six schools, Dorothy found the last old house truly a home.

Then at sixteen she won a scholarship of three hundred dollars that brought her to the University of Illinois, just after the outbreak of war in Europe. Soon she found she was no longer interested in history, biology, Latin and English, but rather in certain attractive books and in writing. She bought more books with her skimpy funds. She did the heavy washing for a poor instructor's family of seven to earn a room in the house—a bare, carpetless, cold room. For two years she read and read, grew ever more interested in the socialist struggle for industrial revolt, for social peace and order.

Catholic Social Teachings

She had been marked permanently by the poverty she had known, by the bitter injustices suffered by the poor and the heavy-burdened (like the Haymarket martyrs and Debs and the Knights of Labor, who suffered to win an eight-hour day—against the bloody opposition of the terrorist gangs employed by industrialist tyrants). It is most interesting here to note that six years before Dorothy Day was born, Pope Leo XIII, who had long watched with a sore heart the exodus of workers from the Church, had bluntly denounced the cruel practices of the industrial world. Very shortly, in three years precisely, a set of dignified Bis-

hops in the United States would offer some revolutionary social proposals, many of which have been embodied in the social legislation of the "New Deal" and the "Fair Deal."

The same social evils which aroused the Pope and the American Bishops excited Dorothy Day also. Her reading and her association with young radical writers at school led her, when the family went back to New York in 1916, to get a job on the staff of the *Socialist Call*.

After a year, during which she lived in a fourth-floor slum apartment, she went to the other radical papers in turn, *The Masses*, *The Liberator*, *The New Masses*. She was a close friend of a young actor-playwright who loved to read aloud "The Hound of Heaven," Eugene O'Neill. Then she became engaged to Mike Gold. A member of the Socialist Party and the International Workers of the World, she never signed as a member of the Communists. Today she admits she was then quite confused, never totally and truly a Communist.

Radical Associations

Interviewing Trotsky, covering strikes, discussing current news and literature and art late into the nights, participating in a pacifist demonstration that landed her in jail in Washington and finally nursing during the flu epidemic filled the war years. From 1919 to 1921 Dorothy Day continued to write and report, both in New York and Chicago, but she also did proof-reading, library work, cashiering in a restaurant, posing for art classes, clerking for Montgomery Ward. Attempting marriage with a divorced man, she spent a year in traveling through England, France and Italy—she has called it an unhappy, wasted time yet also "a time of my own personal joy and heart-break."

Some months at work in Chicago followed her return, months filled with association with old radical friends. Once more she was arrested, this time

in a raid on the I.W.W. house, when she was thrown into jail on a false morals charge.

Released, she went down to New Orleans, worked on *The Item*, living in the French Quarter.

The sale of movie rights to a novel brought her enough money to buy a small place on Raritan Bay, Staten Island. There on the beach, in comparative solitude, with quiet and time for reflection, she at last felt a measure of peace. She began to go to Mass regularly on Sundays at a nearby convent.

Enters Church

Then she entered a common-law relationship with an English anarchist-biologist, bore a child, spent much time at the beach home (all the while drawing closer to the Church). Finally, in December, 1927, she was baptized at Tottenville. Her husband left her.

What would Dorothy Day have been had she not taken this step? God knows. Perhaps she might have become a Communist leader. Almost certainly she would have continued to write. But the infinite wisdom of God has led her to write not attacks on Christian truth, but strong criticism of Christian failure which contains a powerful exhortation to improve:

My criticism of Christians in the past, and it still holds good of too many of them, is that they in fact deny God and reject Him. "Amen, I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (Matt. 25:40), Christ said, and today there are Christians who affront Christ in the Negro, in the poor Mexican, the Italian, yes, and the Jews. Catholics believe that man is the temple of the Holy Ghost, that he is made to the image and likeness of God. We believe that of Jew and Gentile. We believe that all men are members or potential members of the Mystical Body of Christ and since there is no time with God, we must so consider each man whether he is an atheist, Jew or Christian.

You ask, do we really believe it, when we see our fellows herded like brutes in municipal lodging houses, tramping the streets and roads hungry, working at starvation wages or under an inhuman

speed-up, living in filthy degrading conditions. Seeing many Christians denying Him, hating Him in the poor, is it any wonder a heresy has sprung up denying Him in word and deed?²

First Experiences

Some of her first writing as a Catholic appeared in *The Commonweal*, *America* and *The Sign*. She confesses that she missed the excitement of the old radical days, that she thought her work "puny," insignificant. From Communist activity and friends right into the depth of isolation and inaction.

Thirty-six years before, Leo the Supreme Teacher had pointed out to the world (including American Catholics) the urgent need for social reform. "... The poor must be speedily and fittingly cared for, since the great majority of them live undeservedly in miserable and wretched conditions." (*Rerum Novarum*, n. 5). "... The whole process of production as well as trade in every kind of goods has been brought almost entirely under the power of a few, so that a very few rich and exceedingly rich men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of nonowning workers." (*Ibid.*, n. 6).

More than eight years before, the American Bishops officially asked for legislative and social reform measures quite similar to Socialist and Communist proposals.

Slow Social Progress

The principles of *Rerum Novarum* "were long in seeping into the minds of men, even Christian men," says Father R. J. Miller, C.S.S.R., and "... there are those who still promote the disastrous social and economic principles that flourished before 1891"³

Questioning voices had been raised at the grave pronouncements of *Rerum Novarum*, the Bishops' Statement of 1919, even of *Quadragesimo Anno* in 1931. Many Catholics were shocked by these strong words, and some sum-

² *From Union Square to Rome*, p. 148.

³ "The Revolutionary Encyclical," *Catholic Mind*, 49 (October, 1951) 658.

marily rejected the words of the popes. Some said they did not apply to their own countries, but most Catholics simply ignored the documents and made no effort to study them or apply them to local conditions. So thinks Father John F. Cronin, S.S.⁴

The slow reaction in America to *Rerum Novarum* can be gauged from the fact that only in 1939 was a systematic program for introducing Catholic social teaching into our schools undertaken. The need for social reconstruction as envisaged in the two great encyclicals was emphasized (and this seems to acknowledge a transitional stage in Catholic thought and action) by the sixteen Archbishops and Bishops signing the annual statement of 1940.

Teachings Not Known

Last May [1951] it could be said publicly by Cardinal Mooney that "It is regrettable, however, that in this country little progress can be recorded in carrying out or even seriously studying the broad program of the encyclicals for the establishment, on sound moral principles, of a social order which will give consistent form and shape to economic life. This program of social reconstruction is the core of the encyclicals and few have penetrated to it—few even amongst those who sincerely appreciate the high moral tone and the insistence on cooperation rather than conflict, which stand out in these documents so that he who runs may read."⁵ There is evident today discussion of the content of the encyclicals—proof enough that acceptance and support and initiative still are not widespread, even among leaders.

How had Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin been led to start their own wholehearted Catholic agitation for social reform? Providence planned the meeting.

Meets Peter Maurin

One evening some three years after turning Catholic, when she came home from work Dorothy found a little man at her front door. He was waving about him the book by Father Vincent McNabb, O. P., *Nazareth or Social Chaos*. He said he had heard of her from George N. Schuster, then editor of *The Commonweal*, today president of Hunter College.

Peter followed her inside, talking of social change and remedy. After hours spent in discussion, Dorothy told him she had to prepare supper. He followed her into the kitchen, still talking. The next day, the same thing happened: the little man was determined to begin her "Christian education."

A thoughtful and thought-provoking French peasant from a family of 23 children, Peter had taught in a school of the Christian Brothers near Paris, gone homesteading to Canada, entered the United States to work on railroads, farms, in brickyards and steel mills. He had taught French in Chicago, cared for a boys' camp in New York State seven years. Everywhere, he studied, passed on his ideas to others. His passion was to teach. He quoted Lenin, "There can be no revolution without a theory of revolution." So he was trying to formulate a theory of revolution.

Transform society so that it would help people live moral lives: that was the great ambition of Peter Maurin. At the time, a moral life had to be almost heroic: "The extent of the denial of Christ in our own country is shocking to the Christian sense." Thus said the Bishops, April 25, 1933.⁶

Condemns Industrialism

Peter had lived in many places, worked at many jobs, read much and talked much. He, like the Bishops, knew that the essential values were topsy-turvy. "... Industry is considered to be of more importance than

⁴ *Catholic Social Principles* (1950), 41-42.

⁵ "Where We Stand Today," address given at Marygrove College, Detroit, May 15, 1951, *Catholic Mind*, *ibid.*, 595.

⁶ *Our Bishops Speak*, edited by Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. (1952), p. 277.

the moral welfare of man. The lord of all is industry. . . . Industry in our country . . . has not ensured the worker the proportionate gain to which he is justly entitled. It has, however, vastly increased the incomes of industrialists and capitalists." The conclusion was observable everywhere and to all, to Peter and to the Bishops who signed this public statement in 1933.⁷

There was discontent, misery, restlessness—all used as propaganda by the Communists. Even the Bishops speak bluntly: "The real authors of violent and bloody revolution in our times are not the radicals and communists, but the callous and autocratic possessors of wealth and power who use their position and their riches to oppress their fellows."⁸

Yet there had already been positive, constructive suggestions for reform—witness the 1919 Statement. "Had this passage [on the need of a living wage as minimum justice, in the 1919 Statement] been heeded during the dozen years since it was written, it would in itself have gone far to prevent the calamity we now undergo. . . . Pray," wrote the Bishops in 1930, ". . . that a greater energy may enter into the hearts of all to build a social structure . . ."⁹

Worker Program

Peter too had a program. Against the depersonalization which he felt to be the root cause of the universal misery, he urged a five-point platform:

1. To reach the man in the street with the social teachings of the Church.
2. To reach the masses through the practice of the corporal and spiritual works of mercy, at a personal sacrifice, which means voluntary poverty.
3. To found Houses of Hospitality for the practice of the works of mercy.
4. To build up a lay apostolate through round table discussion for the clarification of thought.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 298.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 193.

5. To found farming communes for the cure of unemployment. To solve the problem of the machine. To work for the restoration of property and the combating of the servile state; for the building up of the family, the original community, the first unit of society.¹⁰

The practical realization of Peter's program centered around the founding of a hospice-center where the oppressed and poor (only a small handful of them, true) might find shelter, and where the discussion and teaching might flourish. Peter wanted—just as did the popes who so often had appealed for Catholic Action—to put these truths, which were so radical, into *the actual lives* of some generous men and women, who could work them out in daily practice of Christian charity. The hospice-center would attract Catholics who felt the urge to let their light shine before men for the glory of the Father, and give them the opportunity to study the light of truth and to spread the warmth of its rays.

Admired Distributists

Maurin argued that workers should leave the factories and live on the land in agrarian communities, with the barest minimum of private property. He was a pacifist and an advocate of poverty. His chief reading had been Peter Kropotkin, Penty, Gilbert K. Chesterton, Harold Robbins, Eric Gill. He found in the convert Dorothy Day an ideal disciple, then a zealous collaborator.

There was a "fierce decentralist" attitude which decried statism in Peter's creed and endless lessons, an uncompromising pacifism, a demand for worker-participation in factory ownership and management, semi-rural living, family ownership—and all these things have since figured largely in the life of the little movement established by these two persons.

¹⁰ Dorothy Day, "Peter Maurin, Agitator," in *Blackfriars*, 30 (September, 1949) 409-15.

From the start, the young convert thought this philosophizing wanderer from southern France a holy and wise man, as did many in the little multitudes that everywhere gathered about his ideas. She absorbed his thoughts and attitudes and values, fitted hers and his together and decided, penniless, to establish first a periodical, *The Catholic Worker*, and then his dreamed-of hospice-center. The project was truly dynamic and dynamite.

Catholic scholars have taken the dynamite of the Church; they have wrapped it up in nice phraseology, have placed it in an hermetically sealed container, and sat on the lid. It is about time to take the lid off and to make the Catholic dynamite dynamic.

Worker Beginnings

Practically, there were no finances (and still aren't). ("God sends you what you need when you need it," said Peter to Dorothy. "You have a Father in heaven who knows that you need them all," says Christ to us all.) There was plenty of begging, plenty of praying, plenty of sacrifice—that was their abundance, and somehow, in the fall of 1933, out of it the first Catholic Worker House of Hospitality became a reality. A reality packed with twelve poor, homeless, hungry, dirty women.

The Works of Mercy were to be exemplified by the staffmembers, as perhaps in this country rank-and-file laymen had never before practiced them. Study and discussion also were prominent, wherever Peter was, and he traveled around the country. Some of his words, drawn from St. Thomas, reveal much about his character: "All goods are necessary, useful or superfluous. What is necessary to us we must keep. What is useful we may keep or give away. What is superfluous belongs to the poor. What we take with us

when we die are the things we give away." ("Give, and gifts will be yours," St. Luke tells us are His words.)

Movement Spreads Widely

The dynamite's fuse burned brightly, though slowly, in Canada, Australia and England. More than seven papers fostering its platform were published at the peak of Catholic Worker growth. The paper edited by Dorothy Day herself from 1933 to the present once reached well over a hundred and fifty thousand readers a month. Throughout the land there were established twenty-three hospices for men and women, where more than five thousand were fed every day. About ten are still operating.

Four farming communes were started, with the total standing now at nine—a development that would have warmed Peter's heart. At each headquarters and farm there were and still are endless discussions on Catholic teaching, philosophy, theology, work, missions, asceticism, literature, publishing, other subjects.

Staffmembers move out to set up new centers, on request and with approval of superiors. A Canadian prelate asked Baroness Catherine De Hueck to start a similar project in Toronto, which later became the inspiration of the Harlem (New York) Friendship House and its subsequent Negro community centers in Chicago, Washington, Portland and elsewhere.

Many Devoted Friends

No strict organization characterizes the movement. It has always been a group with loose bonds, open to various personalities and differing positions—sometimes the cause of wholesale criticism if not impatient condemnation by an observer. Peter even used to call it not an organization, but an organism.

Widely known leaders such as Jacques Maritain, John LaFarge, S. J., Carleton Hayes, Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., Frank Sheed, Bishop Hugh Boyle, Bishop Edwin O'Hara, Bishop Waters, Bishop

Busch, a number of abbots, the late Archbishop McNicholas, O. P., Cardinal Hayes, Parker Moon and many others have at various times shown great interest in the movement and given it valuable encouragement and help. The Vatican has sent a "very full and special blessing" to all on the staff and everyone connected with the paper.

"Arouse the Conscience"

The Long Loneliness beautifully portrays Peter Maurin, the inspirer of the dynamic group. One can feel the deep loss experienced by the collaborators (especially by Dorothy) when Peter died May 15, 1949 after five years of complete inactivity. He was 72. *Time* devoted two columns to him, saying

that "many of them were sure that Peter Maurin was a saint." Cardinal Spellman sent a representative to the funeral.

Whatever he was, and whatever Dorothy is, they illustrate the magnitude of the power of God Who chooses the weak things of earth to confound the great.

Most symbolic is the incident of Dorothy asking Peter one day, when apparently they each needed more trust in Providence, "Is this what you meant by houses of hospitality?" They could not squeeze another person into their shelter, were forced to turn away the destitute newcomers.

Peter thought a moment, then said, "At least, it will arouse the conscience."



The Founder Speaks to Young Christian Workers

They are saying, "We can do nothing. We can only wait." But I say that we can straighten out the mess the world is in. I say we can transform the situation.

But we cannot depend on words alone. We must have action—action to help our brothers in need, no matter what part of the world they live in.

We must have action to put into effect the social program of the Church, so that working people everywhere will have the chance to live like human beings.

MONSIGNOR JOSEPH CARDIJN

TRENDS

Textile Unemployment Mounts

From 1924 to October, 1951, 236 textile mills in the New England area have been liquidated or moved away (usually to the Southern U. S.). Between January and October last year 32 woolen and worsted mills were added to the casualty list, according to figures presented at a recent conference of New England governors.

The repercussion among the laboring classes has been serious. New England has lost 60,000 textile jobs since 1948. Unemployment in the industry is widespread at present.

Professor Seymour E. Harris and his special committee, which presented an interim report, have been asked by the governors to obtain information on several important issues, such as the wage differentials between Northern and Southern mills, significance of lack of plant modernization in New England, data on tax differentials, power and fuel costs, availability of risk capital, labor-management policies, work loads and labor costs, regional differences in social legislation and proximity to markets and raw materials.

"The real issue," wrote the president of the Rhode Island Textile Association to the Governor of his state, "is that Southern mills can manufacture goods at a labor cost of 40 cents to 47 cents per hour less than we can."

Another mill head said in Massachusetts, "It isn't wages so much as it is efficiency and workloads." He said another factor is the two separate rates of pay demanded by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, "one for the North and one for the South and that's part of your trouble."

A special conference to relieve the textile unemployment is in the offing.

Land Program of Bhave

Fantastic or stupid might be the term used to dismiss a notion that you could walk through the country and ask the landowners to give away their holdings to people who need land.

Yet that is precisely the program undertaken in India today, under the leadership of one Acharya Vinobha Bhave, a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. Moreover, according to news reports, Bhave selected for his first experiment the districts of Telengana, said to be widely Communist, terror-ridden,

dangerous both to soldier and policeman.

Within a few days, 15,000 acres of land had been donated by the wealthy to be distributed among the poor and the landless. Custom and greed and the general culture had somehow weakened before the frail 57-year-old pilgrim who trudged along, speaking to the crowds about truth, love and non-violence.

Acharya Vinobha starts the daily march at four in the morning. At five p.m. he holds his prayer meetings and announces the donations.

To date Bhave has received a total of 35,000 acres. The government aids the legal transfers and other processing. The pilgrim hopes to transfer fifty million acres.

Thus he describes his mission: "It is an application of non-violence, an experiment in the transformation of life itself. I am only an instrument in the hands of Him who is the lord of all ages. It is a phenomenon inspired by God."

More "Agrarian Reformers"

As the French government and people grow tired of the long, costly war in Indo-China (which drains off some 400 billion francs yearly and holds down more than 150,000 French soldiers), talk of "agrarian reformers" is cropping up in descriptions of the Vietminh forces.

A recent article in *The Nation* quotes "a remarkable Vietminh leader," who because of his position prefers to remain anonymous. "People here [presumably in Europe, where the speaker is now residing] talk as if there were two real governments, ours and one headed by the Emperor, Bao Dai. But Bao Dai is no ruler" Yet: "We are not fighting Bao Dai and we are not even fighting France, which after all is a democratic republic, or the French people . . . We are fighting those who seek by ruse or violence to re-establish their domination."

"The chief item in the government's broad program is agrarian reform. The Western powers don't understand the feeling of Asia about this. Take Korea. The strongest weapon of the North Koreans and Chinese is not the Russian planes you hear so much about; it is the support of the peasants."

As long ago as August, 1948, Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Vietminh movement,

disavowed Communism. In the light of the dissolution of the Indo-Chinese Communist party in November, 1945, the disavowal does not have great significance. His Stalinist roots are unquestionable and enduring.

Moreover, all rumors about change in leadership of the Vietminh have mentioned the names of thorough-going Communists. In March, 1951, Radio Peking announced the formation of a new revolutionary front (Lien Viet) in which the new Labor Party (Lao Dong) will be the chief force. Ho was announced as "honorary" chairman and Ton Duc Thang, Red veteran, was announced as acting chairman.

A French report from Hanoi early in December of last year stated that Ho Chi Minh had been replaced by Truong Chinh as leader of the Indo-Chinese rebels. This rumor, which has cropped up often in recent months, would introduce a member of the powerful clique which ruled the Vietminh government before the Fontainebleau Conference, September, 1946. Truong Chinh is Dang Quan (or Xuan) Khu, one of the intellectuals of the Indo-Chinese Communist party (Tong Bo).

It is true that only a minority of Vietminh partisans are Communists. It was formed by the union of Communists, Socialists and members of the Civic and Democratic parties. But all important posts are now held by loyal Stalinists.

Postponing Retirement

Labor leaders will soon seek legislation encouraging new industries to employ a minimum of older workers.

The hiring of older workers from a growing pool of retired but able men might be accomplished through conditioning government aid on such acceptance by the companies.

So said Solomon Barkin, research director of the Textile Workers Union, at a recent meeting of 75 specialists which discussed various phases of compulsory retirement. Management might take a co-operative step if it would redesign jobs to fit more older workers, added the TWU researcher.

Spokesmen for management, however, seemed to feel that traditional practices were quite satisfactory: traditional compulsory retirement at 65 had "worked well, was economically more feasible . . ." One speaker made much of "the inescapable economics of retirement."

Barkin, however, pointed out living expenses for the growing group of aged are becoming prohibitive for government.

Such a group, said Dr. Edwin E. Witte of the University of Wisconsin, tends to become a discontented minority which appeals for greater "governmentalism."

Agencies for Survival of Freedom

On New Year's day the 45-month-old Economic Cooperation Administration was no more. It had spent \$12 billion in helping Europe's production rise to 40 per cent more than the pre-war figure. One of its biggest by-products was to diminish fear, apathy and poverty for millions of Europeans and Asians.

As agent for the Marshall Plan, which has been called "history's greatest single act of international generosity," E.C.A. did a good job. Foreign aid, however, will not cease with its demise.

The personnel (2125) of E.C.A. will continue at work, under a new-initialed agency, M.S.A.—Mutual Security Agency. Objective: to aid Europe through armament, a goal which will cost about \$6 billion for 1952. In charge of spending is W. Averell Harriman.

Prepare for Racial Integration

Since the St. Louis public schools face an early integration of Negroes into their segregated student bodies, an A. F. of L. local has suggested an 8-point plan to prepare for the change.

The union's committee on democratic rights of members prefaced its program by saying that the trend of Supreme Court decisions is opening the way for integration everywhere. Missouri's state law requiring separate schools plainly cannot be preserved as constitutional.

The wisest way, then, to prepare for the inevitable change would comprise these steps, in the opinion of the union committee:

1. Integration of teachers, first in interracial neighborhoods (this is not against state law).
2. Encourage increased attendance by teachers at intergroup education workshops.
3. Reopen a course in aerodynamics, (earlier dropped when Negroes asked for a similar course) and admit qualified Negroes.
4. Encourage participation by Negro high schools in athletic contests.
5. Urge the scheduling of track meets between Negro and white students.
6. Urge competition with integrated athletic teams.
7. Assign more personnel to intergroup education programs.
8. Establish a human-relations course required for juniors or seniors (the course may include labor-management relations, boy-girl and youth-parent relations also).

B O O K S

FOR MEN OF ACTION.—By Yves de Montcheuil, S.J. Charles E. Parnell, tr. Fides Publishers, Chicago, 1951, 162 pp. \$3.00.

In reading *For Men of Action* I was constantly reminded of books in which I had tried to find answers to the many questions I had in the late 1930's when I was first introduced to the vision of an integral Christianity.

There was no one book you could hand to a layman for a spiritual guide—other than the Bible. I remember being given Myles Connolly's *Mr. Blue*. Several of us re-read and studied Dom Chautard's *Soul of the Apostolate*. Paul Hanly Furfey's *Fire on the Earth* (and later his *This Way to Heaven*), Dorothy Day's *House of Hospitality*, Fitzsimons and McGuire's *Restoring All Things*, Father Ellard's *Christian Life and Worship*, Karl Adam's *The Spirit of Catholicism*, were some of the books that helped us form an idea of our responsibility as Catholic laymen.

I remember trying, several times, to work on Tanqueray's *The Spiritual Life* but never had the will to go through it. But most of the written spiritual guidance a layman got in those days came not from books. It had to be gleaned from periodicals. *The Catholic Worker* was probably the most helpful and opened all kinds of vistas. It introduced me to *The Commonweal*, to *Worship*, (then *Orate Fratres*) and the writings of Virgil Michel, to *Liturgy and Sociology*, to the English and Australian *Catholic Worker's*, to *Colloquium*, *Social Forum*, *Blackfriars*, *Social Problems*, *The Christian Front* (later *Social Action*) and to a dozen others which I read religiously.

Piecemeal answers to many of our questions could be found in the periodical literature. But where could you find some book to integrate these burgeoning social ideas into a "philosophy of life" for a Catholic layman in the workaday world? Who would help the layman interpret his vocation as a Christian in the world? What he needed was not so much a guide for what was called his "private" spiritual life but an interpretation of the supernatural significance of his daily life as a worker, a citizen, a parent. "It all goes together" was an appropriate apothegm, but how did the layman go about tying it all together: the liturgical revival, the social action

movement, the papal call to Catholic Action, the renewed interest in the Bible, the emphasis on Christian doctrine, and the works of mercy, spiritual and corporal?

How did a layman keep from developing a belligerent, sectarian Catholicism as opposed to a militant, all-embracing faith? How simultaneously recognize the separation of temporal from spiritual problems and the absolute necessity of "incarnating" the Christian message? How encourage responsibility of the layman "in the front line of the Church's life" while keeping him close, by charity and obedience, to the leaders of Christ's church. The answers to these and hundreds of similar questions had to be sweated out of countless sources, an article here, a paragraph from this book, a sentence or two from a retreat, or a moment at prayer.

Men of Action will not answer all of these questions. But it does try to grapple with more of the theoretical and practical problems faced by a Catholic layman than any book I have ever seen. The only book that resembles this one is E. I. Watkin's *The Catholic Centre*. But Watkin ranges over many more subjects in more sweeping terms. Father de Montcheuil wrote (he was killed by the Gestapo in 1943) for the college students and Catholic Action groups to whom he was a spiritual adviser. He is writing primarily for those Christians who have answered the divine call to a vocation in the world; it is to help them with their temptations and their hopes.

It's the kind of book I would like to have read in 1937. For the purposes outlined above I don't know of a better volume to recommend to a wondering Catholic layman.

ED MARCINIAK
Catholic Labor Alliance
Chicago, Illinois

MARRIAGE, MORALS AND MEDICAL ETHICS.—By Rev. Otis F. Kelly, M. D., and Frederick L. Good, M. D., LL.D. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1951, xvi, 202 pp. \$3.50.

The authors are clearly competent. Both are doctors of medicine. One is also a legitimate specialist in psychiatry and, furthermore, a Catholic priest. The other is Professor Emeritus of obstetrics as well as

a doctor of medicine, and the list of his honors and degrees is elaborate.

The authors *need* to be learned men for they have undertaken a work of encyclopedic grasp. They cover an enormous amount of matter. They begin with the Christian concept of marriage. They explain the contract of marriage, which for the baptized is the sacrament, in what is almost exclusively a well-knit concatenation of fundamental definitions. They move, then, to the preparation for marriage, both canonical and 'natural' (or common sense). Here they outline soundly but sparingly the impediments to marriage, as the Catholic Church lists them, and they survey the thorny matter of what makes matrimonial consent and what vitiates that consent.

Fundamental principles of morality follow, again rather in definitions than in worked-out detail and presentation. Then there is a brief account of "the sexual constitution," by which words are meant a well-abbreviated anatomy along with a very short account of the span of the sex life and of its incident problems. Natural conception, pregnancy and labor are touched on. (Artificial insemination is noted, with Pius XII's words on that subject.) Then follow the so-called 'complications' of pregnancy and "other pertinent conditions."

There is a small section devoted to the regulation of conception, again giving prominence to the papal teaching. This section is largely spent on what might be thought a too optimistic account of the success in practice of the rhythm theory. This is followed by a terse report and condemnation of contraceptive practices. A healthy, temperate and useful introduction is given the reader on the subject of psychiatry. Then, succinctly, are resumed such technical ecclesiastical points as matrimonial court procedures with the possible reach and ramifications to be encountered therein. The final section of the book is wisely given to Baptism and Extreme Unction with a healthy reminder about "sick calls."

If all this wealth of matter were followed by an Index, it would be better, even though the *Table of Contents* is well elaborated.

Now an old practitioner in the field of counseling will find no point of practical importance unnoticed in this magnificent condensation. But, surely, the book is not one from which the reader can expect to learn first hand. It is rather a stupendous compendium wherein one can review with a minimum of waste effort and irritation. Everything that is touched is defined.

There is no ambiguity. But such brevity will tantalize the less expert reader.

The authors tell us that the medical information is for priests, that the moral and dogmatic information is primarily for doctors of medicine, for nurses, for social case workers, for those, in general, who deal in this area of human problems. Now the difficulty which comes very much to life in this compact volume, magnificent though it be and epoch-making, is a very real one. There is the problem which the training of those who are to be priests has not universally answered satisfactorily as yet: "How much medicine, anatomy, psychiatry should the average priest know?" And there is the co-relative question: "How much should doctors of medicine and all who counsel in the moral field know of the working of moral principles?" And there is the second question: "How many, inadequately prepared, may still and nevertheless undertake to be dogmatic, to 'prescribe,' whether in morals or in medicine, if they are given a sort of encyclopedic view of both fields?"

These are points which indicate that those who advertise this book should be prudently cautious. For here we have a book which will be fine for those who know how to use it. Yet it is a book which will quickly attract those who do not know how to use it. For example, it would not be a whit worthwhile in the hands of those preparing for marriage. It will not be good for the married and perplexed. It will definitely not be good for those who like 'short formulae'—as Augustine phrased it—which they can apply, but who refuse themselves the laborious efforts of learning principles and their application at length.

If it be argued that there is no cure for the impetuous and that there is no safeguarding the rash, then I hope indeed that the sale of the book is not large. But for those who really do know how to study and how to use their learning prudently, the book will be a most valued companion. Such competent readers will know, for example, when the opinions categorically asserted are more intransigent than need be. And such will know how to deal with the fact that in medical and surgical practice and techniques the authors are very positive but may not always be giving the more commonly accepted views.

The book will undoubtedly focus and clarify the whole field. It is a great and a timely book.

Yet I have one more—and most important—observation. Though with my

SOCIAL ORDER

above-mentioned cautions I heartily thank the authors for a timely and a great book, yet I still find a woeful lack.

Here, then, I believe that I can call the authors' attention to a point which is of basic importance, especially now when the moot question of "socialized medicine" is so much in the air.

The authors, as is obvious, are top-notchers. They speak in terms of the latest in research-findings and in techniques which can be employed for the amelioration of the lot of suffering humanity. But do the authors realize how significant would have been a reminder from them that all the doctors of medicine have an imperative duty to keep abreast of the best findings of modern research? I can illustrate my point by an example. The J. A. M. A. publishes studies occasionally on the state of the practice of medicine in certain specialties and in certain areas. One I have in mind—(J. A. M. A., August 11, 1951, pp. 1388 ff.)—boils down to this: For three reasons more women and more fetuses, more babies die than should. The three reasons are 1. the poverty and ignorance of the patients, 2. the lack of sound instruction as well as for other reasons, and 3. the *unwillingness of the medical fraternity to learn!*

Is it not a fact that courts of law, when called on to pass on suits involving malpractice, take as their standard: "The normal average of 'good' medicine as practised in this vicinity"? And is this not an admission that the standard varies from place to place? And is it not, then, a truth that doctors of medicine ought to have a burning ambition to keep abreast of the best, to make available the best, to be themselves the best?

Yet—maybe wrongly—I fail to find in this book a sure and clarion insistence on the need there is of knowing the best, of being able to use the best, of being content with none but the best. I think that there is a weakness observable today in medicine and in its practitioners, no matter how noble and generous they are. That weakness lies in the so-called "medical ethics," forbidding criticism of a colleague, making it near to impossible to turn up a charlatan, countenancing by indirection and silence many a practice which men of wholesome principles abhor. I know how difficult it is for the individual to run counter to this "wall of silence." But in a book, so sound, so fearless, so clear as this, I miss this desirable, this necessary point.

BAKEWELL MORRISON, S.J.
St. Louis University

THE NATURE OF LAW.—By Thomas E. Davitt, S.J. Herder, St. Louis, 1951, 274 pp. \$4.00.

In modern times the prevailing conception of law is derived from the sociological notion of the group. A consideration of the human person has become less and less the foundation of law and authority, no matter how much modern democrats protest the inviolability and dignity of the individual man. What is needed as the true foundation of the notion of a democratic society is a proper view of law, order, right, authority and obligation as derived from a carefully thought-out psychology of man.

Fr. Davitt has done a great service in providing us with the historical background necessary for such an undertaking. Not a doctrinal study, this book traces historically two major schools of thought on the nature of law and its foundation in a philosophy of man and being. If a theory of law is grounded on a philosophy which holds that man is but a highly complex brute, or is a being whose reality is submerged in the sociological group, then law is one thing. If, however, man is an intellectual being whose truly human activities are rational and voluntary, then a very different philosophy of law will follow.

In the four hundred year period of the history of philosophy from St. Albert to Robert Bellarmine which Fr. Davitt examines, there are two major sets of answers to these questions. One set is given by those philosophers who roughly fall into the Augustinian tradition. They maintain the primacy of the will; direction and command belong to the will alone. Hence law is of the will. Since the will is autonomous it cannot be drawn by the necessity of a means-end relationship as perceived by the intellect. Obligation or moral necessity is therefore wholly on the side of the will. A law may oblige in conscience, then, only if the lawgiver wills that it oblige. Purely penal law is the logical outcome. The chief representatives of this school of thought are Henry of Ghent, Scotus, Ockham, Castro and Suarez. Not all touch upon the consequences in law of their philosophy of intellect and will. The position is, perhaps, most ably and completely expressed in the writings of Suarez.

The philosophies of the second group of thinkers examined by Father Davitt tend to stress the primacy of intellect. St. Albert, St. Thomas, and the Thomistic commentators, Cajetan, Soto, Medina and Bellarmine, represent this viewpoint. It is St. Thomas who first offers a theory of

law clearly and explicitly based upon a philosophy of intellect and will. For him the intellect is the primary faculty, but it by no means follows that St. Thomas is a pure "intellectualist." The labels of intellectualism and voluntarism are far too inaccurate to fix the division between the two schools of thought. Suarez, for example, while stressing the primacy of the will in the act of commanding, is much removed from Ockham's doctrine that the free will is outside nature and therefore cannot be necessitated by the intellect. It is to the author's everlasting credit that he shuns these misnomers.

For St. Thomas the relationship of the intellect and the will is one of mutual causality. Fr. Davitt makes clear that the notion of the primacy of the intellect in St. Thomas is based on the much subtler notion of the relationship of the two powers in the acts of election and command. St. Thomas in some key passages of the *Summa Theologiae* distinguishes the two acts and establishes their relationship as one of composition in the order of formal and material causality. Thus he is able to avoid asserting that election includes a command to the will which it has no choice but to obey.

Medina missed this point entirely, and the upshot of his philosophy is a tendency toward intellectual determinism. It is this view which rightly agitated Suarez who, unfortunately, considered it the true mind of St. Thomas. Without prejudicing freedom then, St. Thomas is able to justify the mutual causality of intellect and will. Thus the will is morally necessitated through the intellect's proposal to it of the necessity of a means-end relationship. Law is a direction to the end and consequently obliges universally, since obligation derives not from the will of the law-giver, but from the necessity in things as perceived by the intellect. All laws oblige in conscience, and there cannot be an act falling under the scope of civil law which has no moral implication. The great danger in the position of men like Castro and Suarez is precisely that a good part of human actions are divorced from the sphere of morality. Indeed Kant's disastrous division of the moral and juridical order originated in a similar philosophical climate.

The particular merit of Fr. Davitt's work is his analysis of St. Thomas. He has done an excellent job in clearly establishing the true mind of Aquinas. It is interesting to note as the author points out that it is Bellarmine, a much ignored Thomistic commentator who perceives

more clearly than any other the thought of St. Thomas. There is, perhaps, a tendency, natural in a work of this type, to overstress similarities among thinkers and to strain somewhat to establish a grouping. This is not to say that the tendency obscures or detracts from the work as a whole. It is a brilliant historical exposé, and one hopes that the author will undertake a complete doctrinal study of St. Thomas' theory of law and its foundations in his philosophy of intellect and will.

THOMAS P. MCTIGHE
Maryville College
St. Louis

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF A WAR-BOOM COMMUNITY.—By Robert J. Havighurst and H. Gerthron Morgan. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1951, xix, 356 pp. \$4.00.

This is the story of what happened to the people and the institutions of a small American town as it went through an industrial boom during World War II. In 1942, Seneca, Illinois, was a conservative, static little town of 1235; two years later, as a busy shipyard center for the building of LST's the population had grown to 6600. To care for the inrush of workers, public housing projects were built, business, churches and schools expanded, and the entire institutional complex of the village was transformed.

The purposes of the survey were: 1. to study the adaptation of social institutions to rapid social change, 2. to study the adaptation of people to new conditions of living, 3. to study the influence of a crisis on the long-time history of a community and 4. to make a record of one significant bit of American life during wartime. Two field workers collected most of the data. Their procedure was simply that of recording the relevant changes as they took place.

Successful adaptation to rapid social change implies the preservation and creation of those community values which enable people to remain and live and work with reasonable comfort and satisfaction. In a war-boom community optimum adjustment requires leadership, physical and economic facilities, knowledge of how social and economic institutions work and favorable community attitudes. How did Seneca meet the challenge?

Although \$6,000,000 of government money was used to expand the facilities of the community, housing, water supply and sewage disposal were sources of dissatisfaction until near the end of the boom. Leadership seems to have been mediocre.

SOCIAL ORDER

Success was most apparent in expanding those institutions where previous experience had taught the people to think in terms of the community. Hence the churches and schools adjusted fairly well in comparison to recreational and civic services. The old-time residents looked down upon the newcomers and communication between the two groups remained at a minimum throughout the war. When it was over, the citizens of Seneca heaved a sigh of relief; they had some new buildings and some interesting memories, but most seemed glad to settle back to normalcy.

Although this survey makes no contribution to social theory, it is an interesting case study of a boom town during the war. An interested taxpayer, reading between the lines, will find how some of his money was spent.

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.
Institute of Social Order
St. Louis, Mo.

REGIONALISM IN AMERICA.—Edited by Merrill Jensen. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1951, xvi, 425 pp. \$6.50.

The papers included in this volume were delivered at a symposium on American regionalism held at the University of Wisconsin in 1949. The contributors to the symposium were men from various academic fields and from public life who had in common the fact that they were concerned with regionalism either as a field of research or as a matter of practical administration. The purpose of the symposium was to work toward a clarification of the concept of "region" and to show its utility both as a tool for research and as an approach to problems of public administration.

The book is divided into five parts. Part I gives the history of the concept, regionalism, from the eighteenth century to the present. Part II is an account of three regions: Old South, Spanish Southwest and Pacific Northwest. Part III deals with regionalism in American literature, architecture, painting and linguistics. Part IV gives an account of three regional programs: the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Great Lakes cutover area and the Missouri Valley plan. Part V concludes with papers by Louis Wirth and Howard Odum. These two scholars reach almost total disagreement on the value of the whole concept of regionalism as a tool for research, as a method of interpretation and as a program of public administration.

MARCH, 1952

It appears from this volume that regionalism is not one but many things. It follows that what constitutes a "region" will depend on the number and character of the major indices employed for its delineation. If this fact is kept in mind, the concept can prove meaningful. For this reason the present tendency to employ a large number of indices to delineate an area tends to diminish the utility of the concept since significant differences are concealed under the spurious similarity which results from totaling the score of the indices.

The complexity of the regional concept, so clearly indicated throughout the papers, need not diminish its utility. On the contrary, its very complexity renders it a flexible tool for research and administration providing, as I have indicated, that the "region" be understood in terms of the indices which have been employed to delineate it. This volume will be of value not only to the research student but also to the organizer and administrator of public affairs.

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.

MAJOR PROBLEMS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY: 1950-1951.—Prepared by the Staff of the International Studies Group of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. 1950, xiii, 416 pp. \$3.00.

An informed and responsible American public opinion on foreign policy is the special objective of various publications that have been issued annually for the past five years. The Council on Foreign Relations recently published its fifth annual review of American foreign policy, and now the Brookings Institution offers its fourth volume on problems of international import that affect the United States.

Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy presents a brief survey of the current world situation and analyzes the structure of international relations since the end of the Second World War. The interests and objectives of the United States are examined, as are the domestic and external factors that condition the nation's policy and action. A review of some of the main problems of foreign policy that confront the United States constitutes the major portion of this volume.

These problems are grouped according to their political, economic and military security importance and in terms of international organization and geographic areas of the world. Finally, there is included a "problem paper" on the security and sta-

bility of southeast Asia. It comprises an analysis of the main issues in this troubled area, and a discussion of alternative courses of action that are available for meeting the objectives of the United States.

The editors employ a method characteristic of government officials in formulating foreign policy: they explore all possible courses of action, examining their advantages and disadvantages. They do not review the existing official policy, but they proceed within its framework in recommending means to implement this policy.

This analytical survey has the merit of thoroughness and objectivity. It acquaints the reader with policy-making methods and the problems of foreign relations. Although primarily intended for use in college and university training, this study is useful for informal instruction and general reference.

Maps and charts illustrate this edition which also contains a general bibliography and selected references for each problem discussed. A definition of terms commonly used in the study of international relations is included.

MARSHALL B. WINKLER, S.J.
Woodstock College

THE BEGINNINGS OF DIPLOMACY.

—By Regner Numelin. Philosophical Library, New York, 1950, 372 pp. \$12.00.

Sound scholarly research by a member of the Finnish Academy and his leisure time while a diplomat in Brussels contributed in producing an excellent "Sociological Study of Intertribal and International Relations." The book is based upon an impressive collection of carefully utilized sources, from the Bible *via* Caesar and Tacitus to H. Fr. K. Guenther, W. Schmidt, M. Gusinde, and *Anthropos*, all included in the 50-page bibliography. Its thesis: Savages are by no means destitute of what might be called the beginnings of International Law; (p. 58) diplomacy can be traced back to prehistoric people and is found in primitive surroundings. "The picture of war as the prevailing condition of international relations is not quite consistent with the facts," (p. 107) particularly among primitive peoples.

The evidence certainly sounds conclusive. But it may be that it could lead to other conclusions.

Everything depends upon whether we may apply established terms, such as state, nation, government, diplomatic relations, law of nations, in a more or less metaphorical manner.

Man, as a social and rational being, cannot possibly be studied without due consideration for his reactions to family and

group life, and consequently, to group relations. These are directed from the very outset by certain generally recognized basic principles, the sources of customary law which was later on called the law of nature.

By way of analogy and for demonstrative purposes what is usually called the primitive human community may be given the attributes of a sovereign state, with all the resulting derivations. In Chapter XI the author reviews and analyzes in a brilliant historical sketch the development of diplomacy among "historical peoples." There is certainly nothing wrong with describing a primitive messenger or herald as an envoy. Yet what we call diplomatic organization refers to normal and permanently-established channels of international intercourse.

Numelin's study gives an insight into undeniable facts: we have made some progress, but not enough to forget completely that man and not the state is the raw material of political science. We should not concentrate exclusively upon the refined technicality of organization. The basic problem of peaceful interhuman relations are, as in prehistoric times, far from being resolved. We still do not know much more about them than what ought to be. Any ethno-sociological investigation remains incomplete and hypothetical without reference to the solid groundwork of basic social democracy.

K. v. SCHUSCHNIGG
St. Louis University

CAPITALISM IN AMERICA: A Classless Society.—By Frederick Martin Stern. Rinehart & Co., New York, 1951, 119 pp. \$2.00.

I was reminded, while reading this little book, of that fine old joke which pictures Mrs. O'Toole listening to a panegyric being delivered over the mortal remains of her devoted husband, Mike. As she listens to the pastor's rather fulsome praise, a look of puzzlement grows on her face. Finally she bends over to her little daughter and whispers, "For heaven's sake, Kathleen, go up and see if that's your father in the coffin."

Now the point I intended to make was that, like the case being made out for Mike, Stern's case for classless capitalism will sound overstated. On reflection, though, it appears that the more important point to make is quite the opposite. We American readers of Stern may be as myopic as Mrs. O'Toole.

American Catholics can do harm by a hypercritical or unduly defensive evaluation of American capitalism. It has its

SOCIAL ORDER

faults, failures and inadequacies. But let it be seen in perspective—as a human institution in the hands of men who experience the effects of Original Sin. Rather than absorb the European biases of the kind to which Stern addresses himself, we ought to be contributing the intimate understanding of American capitalist objectives and achievements which we alone are in a position to know and assess.

The core thought of Stern that capitalism here is a "classless" system seems indisputable. Its relevance can be seen only through the eyes of Stern's European, Marxist correspondent to whom he addresses these letters. Europe and the U.S.S.R. will never unleash potentially productive forces till they can substitute for their class-caste systems the freedom and mobility of Americans. We are alarmed, for instance, at the statistical picture of income distribution among us; but Stern throws that too into perspective against what Europe has known and looks forward to. Recommended reading.

PHILIP S. LAND, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE IN BUSINESS.—Edited by George Howard Allen. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1950, ix, 255 pp., \$3.50.

The Harvard Business School Association here presents a report of its 1950 business conferences. Eight chapters are the lectures of various business leaders. In the second part five wire-recorded panel discussions appear. Initiative, its scope, development and limitations in modern business are discussed. One interesting discussion concerns the trials of starting a new business. Emphasis is given to the need for education of management and of the community, the latter to the appreciation of capitalism's benefits and the dangers of collectivism.

Cleeton in *Making Work Human* (see SOCIAL ORDER, 3 o.s. [1950] 429) covers most of the human factors discussed, but this book, though less orderly, is more dynamic by presenting almost a Hansard of the proceedings.

While some contributors from management still regard *production* as the end of enterprise, others emphasize the more spiritual and human objective of *service to people*.

Some speakers condemn excessive taxation and anti-trust legislation without mentioning their causation. Pius XII in his Mission Encyclical (June, 1951) declared that whether economic dependence and servitude "arise from the exploitation of

private capital or from state absolutism, the result is the same." His predecessors too have indicated the middle course between excessive capitalism and soul-crippling collectivism. But this book shows that management has come a long way: many are already applying profit sharing and other humanizing principles in their business.

Management and labor and those interested in starting their own business will find the work stimulating.

JOHN J. G. ALEXANDER, S.J.
Weston College
Weston, Mass.

THE SURVIVAL OF POLITICAL MAN.—By Errol E. Harris, Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, Union of South Africa and Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1950, xi, 225 pp., \$4.00.

LEVIATHAN AND NATURAL LAW.—By F. Lyman Windolph. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1951, ix, 147 pp. \$2.50.

The growth of the state has been a cause of constant apprehension to men throughout the past quarter century. Toward the close of World War II, we had a spate of studies of Power, evoked by the totalitarian states of Europe.

The two books reviewed here attempt to wrestle with the question of statism in the international and the national fields, respectively. Mr. Harris is a lecturer in philosophy in the University of Witwatersrand; Mr. Windolph is a practicing attorney in Pennsylvania and the author of two books of essays.

In an introductory chapter Mr. Harris recounts the development of atomic fission and atomic weapons and discusses the imminent threat of a cataclysmic war that would destroy our civilization. The first part of the work then examines our present international political structures: sovereign states, an international organization with no effective means of preventing war and the continued recourse to power politics. Harris determines that a realistic international law is impossible among sovereign states, because 1. it cannot be the framework of a single community whose common good it seeks and whose "general will" it executes, 2. there is no authority which can enforce it or punish its violation, 3. there is no climate of opinion lending it moral support.

For this reason the League of Nations was doomed to be ineffective, and the U. N., despite sections of its charter intended to sanction the preservation of peace, can

be no more successful in the face of sovereignty. To achieve a solution to the problem, nations must surrender their national sovereignty into the hands of a *bona fide* World Government, which will establish a true community among the peoples of the world (after the fashion of a federation) and, consequently, will have a genuine sanction for vindicating the peace arising from the existence of a new international community. This second part of the book justifies its sub-title: "A Study in the Principles of International Order."

The book is eminently worth reading, especially, for its incisive analysis of the dangers inherent in the concept of national sovereignty divorced from the restraints of natural law and of the weakness of U. N. Although his solution is little more satisfactory, because the author naively assumes that the establishment of an international state would bring into being a genuine international community and a (Rousseauvian) World General Will, it can be a stimulant of further searching.

Mr. Windolph's little book, *Leviathan and Natural Law*, is a genial and urbane attempt to reconcile two apparently conflicting concepts of law: those, namely, of Hobbes and of Thomas Aquinas. "I came to believe that the issue between the two competing schools was partly verbal, and that if I could act as moderator in a sort of round table discussion between, let us say, Aquinas and Hobbes, each of them would be compelled to make admissions that would at least narrow the apparent field of disagreement." (p. vii)

His approach to the problem is two-fold: first, by attempting to separate the "things that are Caesar's" from the "things that are not," second, by seeking to discover in the Aristotelian and the Hobbesian theories of government some common ground in a mutual esteem of democracy. His conclusion in the case of Aristotle is couched in these terms: "Hence, since states are more often perverted than good, the rule of the many constitutes on the average the safest type of political organization." (p. 113)

Unfortunately the attempt is not notably successful, partly, because Mr. Windolph wishes to discuss the question in the realm of practical affairs, where it does not belong, and not in the realm of metaphysics; and partly, because there underlie the two theories of the state two radically opposed philosophies of man to which the author did not advert. Nevertheless he has written a lively and stimulating book which affords numerous interesting insights into the practical origin of government.

This is all the more welcome because it

does not make the fatal mistake of considering natural-law philosophy as something peculiarly and intrinsically Catholic. It is true that some of its foremost exponents have been Catholics, but the natural law is something that pertains to man, to every man.

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MANAGEMENT.—By Stuart Chase, Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Edwin G. Nourse and William B. Given, Jr. The School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, New York University, New York, xiii, 83 pp. \$2.00.

This thin volume contains the four lectures given in 1950 under sponsorship of the Edward L. Bernays Foundation. Chase writes from the viewpoint of the social engineer; Ruttenberg, director of the CIO national department of education and research, represents the labor view; Nourse, retired chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and former vice-president of the Brookings Institution, speaks as an economist; William B. Given, Jr., chairman of the board of the American Brake Shoe Company, bespeaks management.

Chase stresses the need for humility and docility (in the primary meaning of the term) on the part of management in availing itself of the findings of the careful and reputable social scientists. Nourse reads management a lecture on courage and initiative and warns management against too much leaning on government in practice while decrying statism and government intervention in theory and propaganda. Given and Ruttenberg have summarized the standard and expected viewpoints on the problem among the better-visioned labor and management folk.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY IN THE USA. A Report By a Mission of European Experts. Published by the Organization for European Economic Co-operation, Chateau de la Muette, Paris, 1951. Distributed by the Columbia University Press, 378 pp. \$6.00.

A group of experts came from 12 countries to tour American pulp and paper facilities in 1950, under the auspices of the technical assistance scheme of the ECA. Thirty-four foreign pulp and paper men, divided during most of their trip into six teams, visited and studied 125 American firms and their methods and operations;

later they composed the reports in this book for their European fellow industrialists and labor and trade association people.

This is a highly specialized book and will not appeal to the general reader. It covers the manufacture of pulp, of paper and paperboard, the machinery and processes, labor and trade associations, working conditions, economic structure and finances of the industry. With an eye to the European reader, the units of weights and measure are in foreign terms. An explicitly technical section, meant for the engineers, makes up the latter half of the book.

The spirit of the writers, their warm gratitude plainly expressed in so many words to the American taxpayers, and the thoroughness of their study, indicate that their sojourn here will redound to the benefit of American and European alike.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

PROCEEDINGS OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON LABOR: Labor in a Mobilization Economy.—Edited by Emanuel Stein. Matthew Bender Company, Albany, New York, 1951, xv, 627 pp. \$8.50.

The present half-war, half-peace economy presents unprecedented problems for policy makers and for administrators in government, labor and business management. Accurate information on the factual backgrounds on manpower, wages and collective bargaining are essential for intelligent policy formation and execution. This book is devoted to an analysis of those backgrounds.

Thirty authors contributed to the work which includes 24 papers; one is the record of a four-man panel discussion, and another is a collaborative study by three authors. The quality of the papers, inevitably, is uneven; the length varies from some that cover less than six pages to the final article, a study of labor relations in milk distribution in the New York metropolitan area, 93 pages in length.

Sixteen of the thirty authors are government or ex-government people experienced in the problems of wage control, labor law and administration. They make an authoritative group, and the academic colleagues and the associates from the legal and labor union fields are experts and scholars. Their work is a valuable contribution to the small body of firsthand and authoritative information available to date. Teachers, administrators, and all

directly or indirectly associated with policy-making in the field of labor recruitment, wage stabilization or industrial relations in these strained days of semi-war footing will want to see these chapters.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

UNIONS BEFORE THE BAR.—By Elias Lieberman. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, x, 371 pp. \$5.00.

The author set out to trace the legal history of labor unions in America, as the sub-title has it, "Historic Trials Showing the Evolution of Labor Rights in the United States." He has accomplished that, and more: this book makes a readable little history of the social, political and legal position of unionism in America through the last 150 years.

Twenty-five key cases, all but three of which moved to final decision in the Supreme Court of the United States, get a chapter each. The pattern of development for each case is similar: the social, political and economic background is sketched, then the facts of the case, the progress through the courts, the opposing arguments, the decisions and the reasoning of the judges, the consequences of the decision.

The book is written by a lawyer, for laymen, in non-technical language. It makes easy reading, instructive reading for the amateur in labor history, satisfying review and delineation of a long and complicated record for the initiate.

Lieberman has written a well-organized book, uncluttered by the external paraphernalia of scholarship, but accurate and sound and square with the facts. It fills a need for collateral reading in courses in labor law and labor economics at the non-professional level, and it will make profitable and pleasant reading for any interested student of labor and social history.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS: What They Are and How They Work.—By Florence Peterson. (Revised edition) Harper and Brothers, New York, 1951, 270 pp. \$3.50.

In the preface to the first edition (1944) of this valuable handbook the author explains that her work is a description of labor unions, intended to indicate how they perform their functions and conduct their daily work as organizations. Since the time of the first edition there have

been many changes in union structure and activity. Consequently a revision of the original work was needed if the book was to serve its purpose. In most of the chapters there are major revisions and additions.

One entirely new section has been added, covering the foreign relations of American unions. Chapter 10, first in the new section, surveys international labor movements prior to World War II. Chapter 11 reviews the international activities since World War II, giving a history of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, its aims and structure, a description of the trade secretariats and of the International Labor Organization, its methods of operation and its accomplishments. An interesting section in the last chapter summarizes union cooperation in United States foreign policy and the non-governmental foreign activities of American labor.

WILLIAM J. NICHOLSON, S.J.
St. Louis University

•

PIONEERS OF LABOR—Jewish Labor Committee, 175 E. Broadway, New York 2, 1951, 43 pp. \$0.15.

This little booklet, the joint work of Judah Drob, Samuel Colton and Ralph de Toledano, traces in outline the rapid growth of the labor union movement in the past twenty years. It is directed to union members primarily and seeks to show them their heritage, responsibilities and opportunities.

•

PIONEERS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT.—By Richard Hare. Oxford University Press, 1951, viii, 307 pp. \$4.50.

The problem that divides and agitates Russian thinkers who are free to think, as well as foreigners who study the Russian question, is the position Russia must fill in the post-Bolshevik world. There are still those caught in mystic exaltation at the thought of a Messianic role Russia is to play when she can again be a free Russian Empire; and there are others who feel that Russia has forfeited any right to lead.

The present book shows that Russian thinkers a century ago were occupied by a similar problem and divided by similarly conflicting solutions. Under Nicholas I as now, thoughts turned to the future, for the then present was considered in bondage to tsarist oppression, analogous to, if infinitely milder than the Soviet brand. There were the Westernizers, who wanted Russia re-

constructed on the pattern of Western democracies, and the Slavophiles, who found their hope in the native qualities of Holy Russia and distrusted a West in decline—a prey to socialism and to impersonal parliamentary majorities.

In his study Mr. Hare analyses the contribution of various Russian social theorists to the polemics on this perennial problem. The pro-Russia - contra - the - West group gets the greater attention and most likely they were the deeper thinkers. Likewise today those who blueprint a guiding pan-Slav or even pan-European role for a regenerated Russia have probably more roots in reality than the separatist national groups that are now the more vocal. We are also given, very briefly for the most part, the Soviet dogmatic definitions regarding these early social philosophers, and in almost every case it represents some distortion of the real sentiments of the man under discussion. If they were all hostile to Nicholas I, they would, on the same premises, be the more bitterly opposed to everything Stalinism stands for.

The treatment of Chaadaev and Leontiev will be welcomed for throwing light on original thinkers, too little known, while the chapter on Khomyakov paints new and very interesting lines in the generally accepted, but distorted picture of him.

MAURICE F. MEYERS, S.J.
Russian Center, Fordham University
New York, N. Y.

•

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNISM.—By Giorgio La Pira and others. Fordham University Press, New York, 1952, x, 308 pp. \$5.00.

LA PHILOSOPHIE DU COMMUNISME.—Par Giorgio La Pira. Section des Relations Industrielles, Université de Montréal, 1951, 466 pp.

The two books under review are English and French translations, respectively, of a series of papers read before the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas, Rome, April 19-24, 1949, and originally published in the Academy's journal, *Doctor Communis*, 2 (1949) 113-392, under the title, "La Filosofia del Comunismo." All of the original papers, except that of Father Garrigou-Lagrange, were delivered in Italian.

The 22 papers, together with an Introduction by Father Boyer and a conclusion by Novello Papafava, cover a wide variety of subjects. Emphasis is upon philosophical differences between Marxism and traditional systems of the West.

Four lectures discuss various aspects of Marxist atheism, five treat of materialism

and its humane consequences, three point out unhuman traits, three discuss sociological and economic ideas. There are other papers on penal law, the status of women, trade unions, conditions of labor, liberty, international relations and the natural sciences.

As Father Boyer observes in his introduction, "one point was stressed over and over again, in the papers as well as in the discussion that followed: If there had been, as the Papal Encyclicals urged, the slightest attempt to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the working classes—aspirations which, be it noted, Communism cannot satisfy but which it exploits to the full for propaganda purposes—there would be no Communism today."

The nature of this work—a series of individual studies—can never have the synthetic organization of such an analysis as McFadden's *Philosophy of Communism* or even the works of Bartoli or Lepp. But it has the advantage of giving more detailed consideration to isolated points.

THE YENAN WAY.—By Ludivico Ravines. Scribner's, New York, 1951, 319 pp. \$3.00.

Only Ludivico Ravines can vouch for the accuracy of the numerous conversations which he reports in his autobiography. But whether they took place as narrated or whether they are appropriate reconstructions, one can learn much from them about the workings of certain types of Communist minds. Intellectuals, in particular, come in for great attention.

Ravines' story deals with the formative years of Communist conspiracy in South America. A native of Peru, he was sent to Europe and, later, to Moscow for special indoctrination in the tactics of the Communist International. The title of the book arises from the Kremlin directive that South American comrades should adopt the tactics of the Chinese, or Yen-an, Communists. During the period of the Popular Front (1934-39), this meant exploiting the gullibility of "innocents," the ambitions of cold-blooded opportunists—in fact, doing anything and everything that could promote anti-fascist fervor.

This book's greatest value is its exposé of how non-Communists can be cajoled, coerced or bribed into supporting a program which will ultimately bring about their own destruction. The reader will find little difficulty in discovering North American counterparts for the many Latin American dupes as well as knowing collaborators who, while never actually joining the Party, helped to make life easier

for the comrades.

Most revealing is the author's struggle against his own creeping disillusionment. Three visits to the U.S.S.R. had convinced him that the Socialist Fatherland was the very antithesis of any Marxist utopia. Yet, for years he continued to cherish the hope that world communism could somehow be elevated to the status of a "democratic" way of life. Ravines' story is just one more instance of how terrifying and difficult to the hardened comrade is the road back to normal living.

WILLIAM A. NOLAN
Institute of Social Order

THE COMMUNIST WAR ON RELIGION.—By Gary MacEoin. Devin-Adair, New York, 1951, 264 pp. \$3.50.

This is the story of Communist efforts to stamp out all God-directed religions, whether Catholic, Protestant, Hebrew, Orthodox or Moslem, and to substitute in their place the cult of Marx, Lenin and Stalin. Since the work is really a reference volume covering the history of modern religious persecution as conducted by Communists, the author relied upon the assistance of numerous collaborators. Not only Russia, and the Iron Curtain countries but China and Korea receive due consideration.

The great amount of detail presented in connection with each country does not make for easy, hurried reading. After finishing the Introduction, the casual reader should turn to the Epilogue, which serves as a general summary of the Communist attack on religion. Then, he can go back over the chapters which deal with particular countries.

Because of its wealth of detailed information this book must become part of the reference section of every Catholic school library.

WILLIAM A. NOLAN

THROUGH EASTERN EYES.—By Henry van Straelen, S.V.D. Grailville Publications, Loveland, Ohio, 1951, 162 pp. \$3.50.

Most timely in the light of recent events in the Orient, this little book built upon lectures by an internationally renowned scholar will aid us to understand the cultures and peoples of that vast area. Father van Straelen, who earned his doctorate at Cambridge, has lived and studied in Japan twenty years and written more than a dozen books in English, French, German, Dutch and Japanese.

Here his thesis is adaptation, particularly in mission work. There are good features in all the "pagan" cultures, as the Popes themselves have repeated of late, and these features should be neither destroyed nor belittled by missionaries seeking acceptance for Christian doctrine. Bishop Sheen lends his support to the principle of adaptation in a short introduction.

The author discusses Oriental reactions to Western ideas and ways, "different mental machinery," language, processes of thought—divergences which have created a gulf in cultures. Then he presents another important factor: the East, having seen our merchants, soldiers, diplomats, adventurers and missionaries, has formed its own opinions about their complex motives—opinions that may shock us. "The secularized, industrialized, post-Christian West stands in the foreground of the picture for the East. In their eyes, we are the representatives of a civilization which has too often denied its own basic principles." (p. 25) If this seems overstated, we may recall that the view is common to Maritain, Dawson, Berdyaev, Chesterton and Gill. This section of the book is penetrating and stimulating.

The last three chapters treat the Japanese mentality, the Asiatic view of Christianity and certain barriers and problems regarding basic Christian teaching. A bibliography of four pages closes the book.

Through Eastern Eyes is an enlightening work. Its observations reveal many new aspects from which our American and Western culture may be examined and found wanting. The book's value towards a truer understanding of the Church's "catholicity" is great.

RAYMOND BERNARD, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

INDEX NUMBERS.—By Bruce D. Mudgett. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1951, x, 135 pp. \$3.00.

Here is an interesting review of the major difficulties in the use of index numbers. Proceeding in text-book fashion, it serves as a "refresher" for those "... who construct or use price indexes." Two current indexes, the wholesale price index and the consumers' price index, are used for illustrative and critical comment.

Prof. Mudgett emphasizes the unreality of fixed bases and, therefore, of the superiority of chain indexes. But there is no satisfactory discussion of the problems that arise when the statistician, like a trapeze artist, starts swinging from one base to another. How can he then keep

the concepts of "standard-of-living" and "cost-of-living" distinct? In fact, although the distinction is elementary, Prof. Mudgett seems to confuse the two concepts (pp. 44-5). Furthermore, most of his criticism does not seem to grasp the point that, in statistics, the problem determines the mathematical process, much as logicians may deplore the lack of rigorous methods. He seems to be aware of this early in the book (p. 27), but insists so repeatedly on rapid changes of bases throughout that he seems to forget the principle.

The printing could have been better. A number of subscripts are not lowered in some equations, and an important one disappeared in the formula for the standard error of the weighted mean (p. 52). The caption of the middle column on p. 116 should be "1935" instead of "1939."

RAYMOND C. JANCAUSKAS, S.J.
University of Detroit

AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.—By W. H. Walsh. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1951, 173 pp. \$2.00.

The Hutchinson's University Library series continues its excellent tradition of providing clear elementary outlines with this study. The book has two parts. The first summarizes much current information about what might be called the criterionology of history: philosophical evaluation of the historian's sources, tools and criteria of truth. The second part gives brief compendia of some attempts to discover unity and meaning in historical events. The theories briefly considered are those of Kant, Herder, Hegel, Comte, Marx and Toynbee. Suggestions for further readings are given in both parts.

ADVENT.—By Jean Daniélou. Sheed and Ward, New York, 1951, 181 pp. \$2.50.

One of the continuing—and wholesome—reactions against both rationalism and positivism is the widespread attempt to discover both unity and meaning in knowledge, especially in man's knowledge of his own history. The present little work by a French student who has contributed many stimulating thoughts to the theology of history undertakes to assimilate Jewish and pagan religious traditions into a Catholic theory of history.

It is a commonplace of Christian thought that the revelation of Christ is at once—and paradoxically—a denial and a fulfillment; it destroys and it perfects. This

truth has been widely and profoundly understood in the realm of Christian perfection. Father Daniélou applies it to the vastly larger area of culture and religions.

Selecting Abraham, Melchisedech, John Baptist and Mary as examples, the author demonstrates that renunciation and fulfillment have as significant a place in the

conversion of the nation as in that of individuals. More significantly, such a view of the world impregnates it entirely with revelation, throwing new light not only upon the trend of history but upon individual and cultural life, as well.

Father Daniélou's little book is rich in stimulating insights.

LETTERS

Capitalism

It is hard to dissect what is, on the whole, so gratifying a review as Fr. Land's article on my *Capitalism* [SOCIAL ORDER, 1 (1951) 412-21]. These therefore are merely comments representing my thoughts as I went along.

1. I freely admit that I have not in this book, or in my earlier books, explored to any great extent the fundamental questions of social life—the value standards *themselves*. My ideal, of course, is not mere change but change *within* a framework of values: "Not satisfaction but 'better' wants" — better not merely economically but morally and aesthetically.

I have failed to develop this side of the problem, not because I am uninterested in it, but because economic science as such has, in my opinion, no criteria for dealing with private morals and aesthetic judgment; and in my work, *so far*, I have been keeping myself on a fairly technical level of political and social analysis. I have, of course, assumed certain values: freedom, tolerance, etc., but I have not written on a specifically ethical or aesthetic level.

2. Coming to technical analysis, however, I do feel that Fr. Land has not quite understood the *complete* inwardness of my analytical scheme. Thus he speaks in his reference to Clark of workers coordinating *together* [for] "a rising living standard and security for themselves."

But it is my fundamental thesis that this reconciliation is never wholly possible (unless, of course, one does it like the Marxians or Keynesians "by definition"). Growth both requires change (new methods, etc.) and causes change (shifts in wants and techniques). And change *necessarily* involves insecurity for someone. *Not* necessarily economic insecurity (supposing everybody to have, say, the same income) but far more serious psychic insecurity—insecurity of power, of friendship, of location, of work. On all this, see my text.

3. The second point, therefore, on which I feel that Fr. Land has failed quite to follow through is in his treatment of my objections to centralized *ex ante* licensing of new investment (p. 419, his review). I object to that method for two reasons: a. it gives immense power to pressure groups who will tend to logroll themselves into industrial stagnation; b. it creates an immensely powerful indirect means of political coercion over the electorate. I develop these arguments at length in my book. It seems to me Fr. Land tends to evade the point by referring to a "voluntary" pacing of wants. This is really a field in which I believe economic analysis is pretty authoritative. And it seems to me that analysis shows that the job *cannot* be fully done by loose "voluntary" pacing alone. Here again I must refer to my text. Furthermore, what we may do with some safety for a short interval, say in a war, is no guide to a long range policy.

But I would not just "take" the "catastrophic consequences." I would avoid them to a large extent by a "filling in," "deficit finance" program.

4. An allied point concerns my reference to the value of "participation." I did not say that the feeling of intimacy, etc., conflicted with the "efficacy" or "efficiency" of large-scale production. I said it conflicted with the *existence* of large scale production. I know no better arguments on this point than the writings of G. K. Chesterton—of which I am an admiring student, even while disagreeing.

I am afraid Schumpeter's address in Montreal does not greatly convince me. In his last few years Schumpeter had become almost hopeless of the future. I think he treated corporatism merely as a "least worst." But in any event, though I was both Schumpeter's student and his friend, I was never his "disciple" in the sense of accepting unreservedly all he had to say. (See my memorial article, "Schumpeter and Keynes," *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 1950.)

"Participation" is only too apt to conflict with change, the good of the part with the good of the whole.

5. I come now to the really important point, the question of "sobriety" as developed in section three of Fr. Land's review. I do not feel that Christianity necessarily implies puritanism or Jansenism. My feeling is that Christ preached not necessarily asceticism, but temperance. All participation in life — even rearing one's family—may "coil, toil, and tease the simple heart." My idea is that a man should try to preserve a decent balance between his means and his wants, so that he never becomes a slave of the latter. Thus I would agree with the second paragraph of Fr. Land's review but not its first.

6. Finally, there is Fr. Land's reference to "leisure for the arts." This I think mistakes the nature of the artist. Leisure may be needed for art *appreciation*, and this can, indeed, be carried into dilettantism. But the real artist knows no leisure. He is consumed with a fierce and restless energy, a lambent flame. It has long been my contention that the *innovating* business man and the artist have a great deal in common.

The pace of my (personal) economy would not, I believe, be too fast, supposing most people to have my (personal) values. The pace of an economy inhabited by restless, crass, stupidly greedy people *will* be too fast. It is the province of the churches to deal with these basic moral questions. They constitute the true "framework of the pricing system." It is not the automobile's fault if a drunk wrecks it! The pricing system, in the same way, will only give us what we put in it. All I was trying to do in my book was to show the fallacy of that modern doctrine of the antichrist—that if we change man's *economic* surroundings we thereby remove the evil from man!

DAVID MCCORD WRIGHT
University of Virginia

Fr. Land's Comment

It is crucial to Prof. Wright's comment on my review of his *Capitalism* that he was not concerned with "the value standards themselves" but kept to a "fairly technical level" After running through his pages again, I cannot but feel that economics and the "technical side of political and social analysis" go *pari passu* in his study with extensive discussions vindicating a set of values.

This seemed to emerge from such typical expressions as the following. In a summary of a final chapter, Can We Stabilize Capitalism? the author says, "From all that *has been said* it will be seen that we cannot answer the question . . . by reference to economic factors alone." The last chapter tells us: "If there has been a massive change in values on the part of the majority; . . . if men are really tired of change, growth, consumer sovereignty, and the responsibilities of democracy, then there is no real prospect for our civilization."

An early chapter, The Requirements of Social Growth, discusses the problem created because "enterprisers cannot function in a culture which is hostile to change," which problem can only be solved by "finding ideologies which would permit sufficient freedom of action to new ideas while maintaining adequate order." Among several criteria here developed, one is criticism. "By criticism I mean insistence upon qualitative standards of social development."

The next chapter discusses the ideology of capitalism, "an ideology providing for continual change and growth." "Its culture has been geared to" Mistaken ideological attacks are discussed and the conclusion made that " . . . a shift in ethical and social ideas within the present economic system might be of far more value in securing our aim."

In a chapter called "the core of the book" Prof. Wright begins by noting "throughout the present chapter we shall find it necessary to refer to one or another of five democratic standards." We end by discussing the question, "How does Capitalism emerge when checked against this list?" A key thought running through this chapter affirms that "the most basic choice that the planners . . . of any society have to make is whether they do or do not want growth." And to give one final instance, in a chapter on Distribution and the Business Cycle, "One of the most important value judgments which we have to make . . . is whether or not we consider a rising standard of living to be a good thing. But a further value judgment was also necessary"

Prof. Wright thus, it appears to me, invited comment on the value system explicit and implicit in his capitalism. I prefaced such criticism as I had to make with the note that "on the whole the set of values Wright sets up appear reasonable enough and consonant with human nature." But there did appear to me a questionable expansionist bias manifested in the passages quoted from among sev-

eral possible summaries (see pages 416-17 of my article).

If next we turn to the very mechanics of the technical system of capitalism, we have the bias confirmed. For capitalism is tied inexorably to the new, and new demand plays a big part. So much is this so that Prof. Wright feels impelled to raise the question whether the system will founder on this shoal. But his answer is reassuring, for "human wants are boundless and endlessly changeable, and human ingenuity will constantly keep producing new methods and new discoveries." In one succinct phrase we are enjoined not to worry "over the failure to form wants fast enough."

This is the essence of the position as questioned. On rereading, I find no evidence among the various enumerations of values of a place for this "pacing of wants" which Prof. Wright now calls for. Had it been in the book's set of valuations, the only question then to have raised—and one I believe which still confronts the author—would be how is this capitalism (described as inherently dependent upon constant succession of new wants) compatible with the new, slowed pacing? Both he and I think it is. But does the possibility emerge from the book?

* * *

Much of Prof. Wright's comment upon my review concerns itself with my attempts to state a theoretical position which (safeguarded, I hoped, from the planners' errors which his book rightly condemns) held out some possibility for the kind of social cooperation required, and indeed, for some *ex ante* planning of production and of want satisfaction, sufficient to permit the exercise of a true social providence. He rejects all this kind of thinking. But how will he work out the required modifications of the capitalism-geared-to-ever-new-wants mechanism? For does not something like this appear to be required on his own showing? He says, "the pace of an economy inhabited by restless, crass, stupidly greedy people *will* be too fast." But against me he says, in the same letter, "Fr. Land tends to evade the point by referring to a "voluntary" pacing of wants . . . analysis shows the job *cannot* be done by loose "voluntary" pacing alone."

Prof. Wright's letter, however, confirms me in the conclusion to my review that what lies between us is only a matter of a little more of this and a little less of that.

PHILIP S. LAND, S.J.
Institute of Social Order

Proportional Representation

I do not wish to engage in an involved controversy with Prof. Schuschnigg about the blame that is or is not due to proportional representation (PR) for conditions in Europe [SOCIAL ORDER, 2 (1952) 29-36]. But I cannot resist the temptation to note with regret that he adduced France to support his argument, although that country never had PR until 1946. If the Fourth Republic "can hardly be described as anything else than a copy of the Third Republic in its functioning," it would appear that PR, present in the latter but not in the former, was not the reason for common defects.

Also I note that he omitted all mention of Eire and, as is customary with all critics of PR, Spain. If PR, as a permanent institution, threatens to frustrate and finally destroy democracy, at least it is not yet clearly evident in the former (which has had four chiefs of state in 28 years), while in the case of the latter, which had 27 cabinets in 56 months (1931-36) without PR, the explanation of instability must be found elsewhere.

The real purpose of my letter, however, is to lament the damage to the cause of good government at the municipal level in this country which such articles may do.

I'll concede—for the sake of argument—all that Prof. Schuschnigg says about PR in national elections and restrict myself to municipal elections. If we accept the principle that PR increases the power of the average voter, we can synthesize many conflicting feelings toward it: It would not be surprising that professional politicians, whose power is proportionately decreased, would oppose PR; that do-gooders look upon PR as a cure-all; that philosophers warn us against it (provided they do not build up straw men to attack); that organized pressure groups dislike it, since it enables the unorganized to work together; that those seeking good government advocate it; that some political scientists believe it will place too much practical power in the hands of the people. (Too much power is bad. Boston's 400,000 voters should not meet weekly on Boston Common to run the city. But if I lived in a village of 400, I might not object to meeting a few times yearly.)

So the question is: Is this power dangerous?

Now moderation should be our guiding star. It seems to me that in American cities the people do not have enough power, that the line of authority from the voter to the mayor is too tenuous. Opposition to PR, which could increase voters' power, should not be seriously con-

sidered until there is more proof of its evils than has thus far been presented. Cambridge, Mass., with PR, has had one chief executive in ten years. Adjacent Boston, without PR, has had six (four men serving six different terms) in the same time.

It is possible that we are too much impressed by one-sided fears, such as the dread of "unstable government" (which is not a present danger here), while we overlook the value of PR in fighting municipal corruption (which is). PR is not a panacea. In some cases it has "failed," just as the secret ballot has "failed." (Incidentally, I never tire of pointing out the similarities between the two.)

PR, to repeat, is not a panacea. It won't grow hair on a billiard ball. It doesn't endow a moron with intelligence nor one who is dishonest with honor. But combined with other circumstances, both fortuitous and auspicious, it has done more to cut dishonesty in Cambridge and to institute non-spasmodic reform than any other non-spiritual instrument in generations.

The children of this world, if not wiser, in this case at least, are more united than the children of light. While so many of the latter, interested in good government, are scared off by Prof. Hermens (and now by Prof. Schuschnigg) from using this potent weapon, the political professionals have few naive illusions. In Massachusetts they have outlawed further extension of PR. I would like to believe that the opposition is due to a fear of unstable government. I can't. . . .

Prof. Schuschnigg may not have intended an unqualified attack on PR. If so, I'll be glad to hear it. I'm simply concerned with the damaging effects of his article. . . .
Boston, Mass.

HENRY S. RYAN

Against PR

There are some main points which are hardly contested: we agree on the final end, which is to find the best and most efficient government within the framework of a working democracy. Furthermore, I trust that we look upon any voting system as a means to this end and certainly not as an end in itself. Therefore I gladly admit that evaluation of such means must be relative and will depend upon varying circumstances.

Hence I certainly do not believe that a discussion *sine ira et studio* of PR could do any damage to the common cause we believe in. If it should, I would greatly regret it.

First of all, what might be true under

certain given conditions on the level of local government assuredly need not be true on the national level, and vice versa. In smaller communities it might be feasible, for instance, to dispense with any kind of popular representation and resort to the original form of direct and immediate popular decisions. Yet the same method would be impractical for larger units—certainly also at a national level. This statement excludes, of course, national plebiscites and popular initiative, since it refers to the day-to-day operation of government. It simply acknowledges that different needs, structures and kinds of decision require different mechanisms.

The matter at issue remains whether or not the Anglo-Saxon majority election system seems to be preferable to the Continental European version of a perfect democracy based on PR.

I still stick to my argument about France. PR in France was not born as late as 1946. Throughout the history of the Third Republic the controversy over the election system continued uninterruptedly. The outcome was that after repeated shifting from one (modified) preference to another (watered-down), and after the adoption of essential features of PR between 1919 and 1927, France had never tried the Anglo-Saxon type of majority representation and felt quite unhappy with orthodox PR, which was reintroduced in 1946. In order to consolidate the political situation, as we remember, the election law was once more amended before the 1951 elections. Some observers maintain that without such an amendment (if pure proportional representation principles had been retained), the combined forces of left and right wing radicals would have gained an absolute majority.

It is true that in Spain the voting system cannot be held responsible for the breakdown of democracy. Majorities and minorities simply were not accepted by one another. This is not surprising since the history of Spain for the past 150 years or so has been marked by an almost uninterrupted sequence of upheavals, inner struggle and constitutional overthrows. It must also be frankly admitted that PR worked quite well in Ireland and—by and large—in the Scandinavian states, Holland and Switzerland. These are fortunate exceptions, not the rule.

It might be worth observing that PR has been discarded in the municipal elections in New York for somewhat different reasons.

KURT V. SCHUSCHNIGG
St. Louis University.

about
n as
y of
over
rupt-
re-
pref-
and
es of
had
ma-
un-
res-
nem-
more
Some
h an
repre-
(ed),
wing
olute
sys-
the
and
l by
since
150
a al-
ivals,
over-
itted
land
avian
these
PR
elec-
erent
NIGG
DER

PR
elec-
erent
NIGG

If you are interested in essentials...

W O R S H I P

(formerly "Orate Fratres")

AMERICA'S PIONEER LITURGICAL REVIEW

- ★ now begins its 26th year with an autographed blessing from Pope Pius XII
- ★ regularly contains articles by front-line theologians, liturgists and Christian social thinkers from France, Germany, England, Ireland, Austria, Italy
- ★ features a **TIMELY TRACT** each month by Rev. H. A. Reinhold
- ★ is written by and for priests, religious and the apostolic, informed laity.

TRIAL SUBSCRIBERS become PERMANENT READERS

Published Monthly	1 year \$3.00 (outside U.S.A. \$3.50)
48 pages	2 years \$5.00 (outside U.S.A. \$6.00)

THE LITURGICAL PRESS

St. John's Abbey

Collegeville, Minnesota

SOCIAL ORDER
3655 WEST PINE BLVD.
ST. LOUIS 8, MO.



